

The Sound of Music

The Semantics of Noise in Early Greek Hexameter

Amy Lather

Wake Forest University

latherak@wfu.edu

Abstract

This paper examines the vocabulary of sound in the *Theogony*, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, and the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* and focuses in particular on the words employed therein to describe superlative forms of music, terms that in different contexts denote clamorous or unpleasant sounds. By drawing attention to the sonic texture of musical performance in this way, each portrayal suggests that music is not ontologically distinct from noise, but emerges from the coalescence of discrete sounds that are not musical in and of themselves. Music and noise thus exist not in a hierarchical relation, but on the same spectrum. And this dynamic is reflected in the very language used to depict these performances, which combines re-workings of Homeric formulae with new or unusual acoustic terminology. Thus music, including lyrical language itself, may become perceptible as such from the skillful organization of sounds into intelligible and distinctive patterns.

Keywords

music – sound studies – poetic imagery – aesthetics – perception

“What is music but organized noises?” quipped the modernist composer Edgard Varèse, and to judge by the depictions of musical performances that will be discussed in this paper, a similar conception of music resided in archaic thought.¹ Words for sounds abound in early Greek poetry, and in archaic hexameter in particular there is no shortage of terms available to denote different

¹ Varèse and Wen-chung 1966, 18.

voices, noises, and acoustic effects, whether musical or not.² Even in portrayals of musical performances, poets often invoke this broader vocabulary of sound in order to communicate the acoustic qualities of singers and instruments. In this paper, I consider three depictions of music in archaic hexameter that are notable for their blending of noisy and musical vocabulary: Hesiod's description of the Muses' song in the proem of the *Theogony*, Apollo's lyre playing in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, and Hermes' invention of the lyre in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*. The examples that I will adduce here are well-worn passages because they provide lengthy descriptions of archaic musico-poetic performances, but I hope to offer a fresh perspective on their contents by demonstrating how the particular terms that appear therein point up the emergent nature of music: that is, how music can seem to develop even from bare, non-musical noises like bangs and cries.

The reason that I focus on these three passages in particular is because of the way that they both introduce new and unusual words to encapsulate music's effects in addition to transplanting Homeric sound terms and formulae into musical settings.³ More specifically, I am interested in the ways in which non-Homeric composers of hexameter (Hesiod and the poets of the *Homeric Hymns*) diverge from Homeric formula patterns. One such example is Hesiod's use of *ἰάχω* in the context of the Muses' procession in the *Theogony* (69), which will be discussed further below. Here his use of *περί* in tmesis with this verb to characterize the way the earth 'resounds with the Muses' singing' (*περί ἰαχε γαῖα μέλαινα / ὑμνεύσαις*, 68f.) recalls Homer's use of the same construction to depict the echoing of screams in confined spaces (*Od.* 9.395; *Il.* 21.10). Similarly, when the music of Apollo's lyre is characterized with the same phrase that in Homer had exclusively described the clanging of a blow against a helmet (*καναχῆν ἔχει* at *Il.* 16.105 and 16.794 and *HH* 3.185), this raises the question as to

-
- 2 On the relationship between sound and lexical semantics in the Greek vocabulary see the seminal works of Stanford 1967, 1969, and 1981. More recently, see Gurd (2016, 1-4) for a succinct but exhaustive summary of the different types of sounds expressed in the Greek vocabulary. The conclusions drawn here are much in line with those made in his book, particularly in his identification of "the distinction between good and bad sound" as a "central aesthetic theme" (12). On constructions of the voice and vocality in ancient literature, see Butler 2015.
 - 3 Cf. Bettini (2008) who is similarly interested in the interaction between language and sound but concentrates primarily on animal voices. See also Cook (1990, 4) on the symbiosis between language and imagery on the one hand and music on the other, "a musical culture is, in essence, a repertoire of means for imagining music; it is the specific pattern of divergences between the experience of music on the one hand, and the images by means of which it is represented on the other, that gives a musical culture its identity".

the musical connotation the poet is identifying in using this term to characterize not a violent blow, but the sonorous quality of the lyre.

As John Foley (1999) has argued, the intelligibility of Homeric words and formulae depends not on an audience's familiarity with the literal definition of a term like ἰάχῳ, but on their understanding of the term's significance within the semantic network comprised by the Homeric poems writ large, that is, how the word fits Homer's "way of speaking' as a whole" (205).⁴ As I will argue in greater detail below, such apparently self-conscious re-workings of Homeric acoustic language suggest that part of what makes these words significant in new, musical contexts is precisely those other, non-musical settings in which they had previously appeared.

An additional reason that such uses of Homeric terms merit further study is because they are unique across the poetic corpus in being deployed in this way. In tragedy, for instance, terms like ἰάχῳ and δοῦπος (used of the Muses' procession at Hes. *Th.* 70) retain the senses they had in Homer: the musical connotations developed in Hesiod and the *Hymns* did not catch on.⁵ Thus this paper is also a study of how these poems combine traditional or formulaic phraseology with innovative expressions in the form of neologism and *hapax legomena*. For it is precisely this combination—of novel uses of well-established terms together with entirely new words—that will emerge as a consistent feature of the depictions of music on which I will focus here. The effect of this combination is to intimate that music is fundamentally a collection of noises which, like language itself, only become meaningful *in relation to* other sounds. And this ordering of sounds, as we will see, depends upon the skill and creativity of the performer(s).⁶ Furthermore, the dual emphasis on vision as well as audition

4 On particular formulae and phraseology see especially 201-37. See also the *Lfgre* entries on the individual terms discussed in this paper, which provide ample illustration of the distinctive nuances associated with each word across different contexts.

5 Unlike a term like κελαδέω, for instance, which is used in Homer to characterize e.g. rushing rivers (*Il.* 7.133, 21.16) and roaring crowds (*Il.* 9.547, 18.530, 23.869), but beginning with Pindar comes to refer to singing voices in particular (e.g. Pind. *O.* 10.79, 6.88; Eur. *IT* 1093; Eur. *Hel.* 370 f.), as I discuss in a forthcoming paper.

6 Cf. the description of the dichotomy between noise and music formulated by Goddard, Halligan, and Hegarty (2012, 2), "noise functions as the 'other' to both language and music, considered as so many systems for organizing noise into meaningful or even beautiful modes of expression. Noise, on the other hand ... functions as the disturbance of a meaningful sonic system". Gurd (2016) likewise delves into the way archaic and classical Greek literature portrays the disruptive force of noise, but as I will show here, these passages suggest that this dichotomy is not always hard and fast, since they indicate that noises are not always a threat to musicality, but indeed may be constitutive of music.

that appears in these passages will underscore the importance of dance and movement for making sounds comprehensible as music.

1 The Clamorous Music of the Muses and Apollo

The proem of Hesiod's *Theogony* is a fitting place to start because it depicts the Muses, the paradigmatic musical group, beginning with an account of their voices and songs (1-10, 36-52) followed by a description of their performance on Mt Olympus (63-79).⁷ And Hesiod's account of this divine music exemplifies a phenomenon that will resurface in the *Homeric Hymns* to Apollo and Hermes: namely, the use of Homeric terms for violent sounds in a way that draws attention to the permeability between cacophonous noise and beautiful music.

Embedded among the many references to the beauty and charm of the Muses' voices and dance in the *Theogony* (e.g. 7f. χορούς.../ καλούς, ἰμερόεντας, 10 περικαλλέα ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι, 41 ὅπῃ λειριοέσση, 65 ἐρατὴν ὄσσαν) are two words that stand out because their association with song seems puzzling: ἴαχε and δοῦπος.⁸ Moreover, they appear in close succession and describe this chorus' procession to Olympus (68-71):

αἱ τότε ἴσαν πρὸς Ὀλύμπον ἀγαλλόμεναι ὅπῃ καλῇ,
 ἀμβροσίῃ μολπῇ· περὶ ἴαχε γαῖα μέλαινα
 ὑμνεύσαις, ἐρατὸς δὲ ποδῶν ὑπο δοῦπος ὁρώρει
 νισσομένων πατέρ' εἰς ὄν.

Then they went towards Olympus, delighting in their beautiful voice and heavenly celebration: the dark earth resounded with their singing, and a lovely sound rose up beneath their feet as they went towards their father.⁹

7 The proem is also notable for the reverberating sound-effects achieved through numerous repetitions of the same sounds (e.g. Ἑλικωνιάδων, 1; Ἑλικώνος, 2; ζᾱθεόν, 2; ζαθέοιο, 6, ζαθέοιο, 23; βρόντην, 140; βροντήν, 141). On such sound-patterns and their service to euphony see especially Stanford (1967, 74-98). I thank the anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to the presence of this phenomenon in the *Theogony*.

8 For further comments on the other sounds associated with these terms see Kaimio 1977, 79f., 229 (δοῦπος) and 13, 82, 88, and 145 (ἴαχω). See also Gurd 2016, 34f. specifically on the violent connotations of δουπέω, δοῦπος, and ἴαχω.

9 Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

While the idea of echoing or resounding that is conveyed by *περί ἴαχε* is not unique in archaic portrayals of song and indeed was one that had appeared earlier in the poem (where the Muses' voices make the peaks of Olympus and the homes of the gods 'ring out,' 42f. *ἤχεϊ δὲ κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου / δώματά τ' ἀθανάτων*), the verb *ἰάχω* does not carry any apparent musical connotations. For unlike the *ἤχέω* that appeared at line 42, *ἰάχω* appears very frequently in Homer, whereas *ἤχέω* never does.¹⁰ More significantly, *ἰάχω*, prior to this instance, was associated in particular with loud, roaring sounds like large groups of shouting troops (e.g. *Il.* 2.333, 4.506; *Od.* 23.766), shrieking (e.g. *Il.* 5.434, 11.463; *Od.* 10.323), and the reverberations that such powerful noises create.¹¹ And the close link between *ἰάχω* and very harsh sounds is emphasized by its frequent qualification with the adjective *σμερδαλέος* (e.g. *Il.* 5.302, 8.321, 16.785; *Od.* 22.81), a term that will resurface in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes'* characterization of the lyre's sound in a passage that I will discuss below.

The only near contemporary example for the *Theogony's* contextualization of *ἰάχω* within a musical setting comes from Sappho, who recounts how choruses of men 'shouted a lovely, high-pitched cry' at the wedding of Hector and Andromache (fr. 44.32f. *πάντες δ' ἄνδρες ἐπήρατον ἴαχον ὄρθιον / Πάον' ὀνκαλέοντες*). But whereas this passage's use of *ἰάχω* diverges from its Homeric predecessors by equating it with singing, by making the earth the subject of the verb, the passage from the *Theogony* focuses more closely on the idea of echoing that often accompanies this verb in Homer. A further affinity to Homeric usage consists in Hesiod's placement of *περί* in tmesis with *ἰάχω*, since this is a construction that also finds precedents in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 21.10, *Od.* 9.395). By situating this Homeric phrase in the context of the Muses' song, Hesiod thus renders a stark disparity between the loveliness of the kind of sound depicted here and those that the same phrase had customarily denoted in Homer.

For in the *Theogony*, the 'dark earth' echoes back not a cry or scream, but the sound of the chorus' singing (*ὑμνεύσαις*). Transplanted into this setting, then, where *ἰάχω* forms part of the superlatively lovely soundscape created by the Muses, it expresses how beautiful sound can have the same reverberating effect as the loud and powerful noises it describes in Homer. This idea is made explicit by Hesiod's specification that it is by *means* of the chorus' 'hymning'

10 On their shared linguistic ancestry see Chantraine 1968 s.v. *ἤχη* and *ἰάχω*.

11 E.g. *Od.* 9.395, where the Cyclops' screams echo through his cave (*περί δ' ἴαχε πέτρῃ*), cf. *Il.* 21.10, where the banks of the river Scamander 'resound loudly' with the cries of drowning men (*ῥχθαι δ' ἀμφὶ περί μεγάλ' ἴαχον*). See also *Lfgre* s.v. *ἰάχω* (4), where these Homeric passages are grouped with the passage from the *Theogony* under question as instances where the verb seems to refer to a kind of "reverberation" (*widerhallen*).

(ὑμνεύσαις) that the land resounds. The close connection of the two ideas, one musical (ὑμνεύσαις) and one not (περὶ ἴαχε), creates a paradoxical combination that draws attention to the fact that beautiful music and cacophonous noise can achieve similar acoustic effects, but with radically different phenomenological qualities.

An equally apparent paradox arises from the allusion to the ‘lovely din’ (ἐρατὸς δοῦπος) of the Muses’ dancing at *Theogony* line 70: ‘And a lovely din rose up from their feet,’ (ἐρατὸς δὲ ποδῶν ὑπο δοῦπος ὀρώρει). While δοῦπος does feature in Homer as a way to characterize the sound of footfall in particular (*Il.* 10.354, 23.234; *Od.* 16.10), its qualification here with ἐρατὸς is unprecedented and verges on the nonsensical, given that elsewhere it usually designates a ‘thud’ or ‘crash.’¹² This begs the question why it is the term of choice to refer specifically to the sound generated by the Muses’ feet (ποδῶν ὑπο, 70) as they process to Olympus.¹³

Moreover, the fact that the adjective-noun ἐρατὸς δοῦπος presents an apparently incongruous combination of ‘loveliness’ and ‘thudding’ draws attention to the fact that δοῦπος, as an acoustic expression, alone does not connote anything musical, but depends upon the modification of ἐρατὸς in order to make it clear that this is no ordinary stamping noise, but one befitting the Muses themselves. For although it is not specified that they are dancing, the attribution of this adjective to the sound of their feet, together with the allusion to their ‘beautiful voice’ (ὀπὶ καλῇ) on the one hand and ‘divine festivity’ (ἄμβροσίῃ μολπῇ) on the other (since μολπή can refer to both song *and* dance), strongly suggest that it is through dance-steps that the thudding of their pounding feet becomes ‘lovely’.¹⁴ The phrase thus indicates a synaesthetic dimension to the Muses’ procession by drawing attention to the fact that their movements are

12 On the Homeric formula ὄμαδος καὶ δοῦπος cf. Kaimio (1977, 79f.), who observes that it “expresses a confused noise, where sounds of different origin are heard together”.

13 Already in Homer there is an indication of interest in the look and sound of dancing feet (*Od.* 23.145f.; *Il.* 18.569-72), but in both instances there is no suggestion that such movements are aesthetically pleasing. In *Od.* 23.145f., Odysseus’ palace “echoes with the feet of dancing men and beautiful-girdled women” (τοῖσιν δὲ μέγα δῶμα περιστεναχίζετο ποσσὶν / ἀνδρῶν παιζόντων καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν), but the emphasis here is on the fullness of sound, not on the beauty thereof. See also *Il.* 18.571f.’s allusion to dancers “pounding in unison” (ῥήσσοντες ἀμαρτῇ) as they “follow, kicking up their feet in dancing and shouting” (572 μολπῇ τ’ ἰυγμῷ τε ποσὶ σκαίροντες ἔποντο), which provides the closest analogue for the scene depicted in the *Theogony* because of its attention to processional dancing in particular.

14 Cf. West (1966, *ad loc.*): “It is the implied dance to which ἐρατὸς is really appropriate”.

both visibly and audibly lovely. In other words, the chorus of Muses, the chorus *par excellence*, make their footsteps as beautiful as their voices.

Just as footfalls are imagined to become ‘lovely’ when they belong to the dancing Muses, so too the use of a term (δοῦπος) generally reserved for thudding sounds in conjunction with ἐρατός, a word that signals high aesthetic value, highlights how apparently ‘noisy’ words can nonetheless acquire a special, musical significance by pinpointing those very particular acoustic elements that together comprise musical experience. Moreover, that the δοῦπος is mentioned in the same breath as their singing suggests that this sound is as fundamental to the Muses’ song as their voices. In its infusion of noise words like ἰάχω and δοῦπος within this portrayal of the divine, virtuosic cadence of the Muses, this passage thus imagines music not as belonging to a distinctive perceptual category, but as a phenomenon that arises from the coalescence of all the different kinds of sounds that occur in live performance.

That even divine music like the Muses’ can be parsed into separate physical, acoustic elements is also expressed in the half of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* that deals specifically with the Pythian Apollo. Here Apollo, as he makes his way to Olympus, plays the lyre and the sound is dubbed a *καναχή*, a kind of metallic ‘clanging’: ‘And his lyre gives forth a delightful twang beneath the golden plectrum’ (184f. τοῖο δὲ φόρμιγξ / χρυσέου ὑπὸ πλῆκτρον καναχήν ἔχει ἱμερόεσσον).¹⁵ In this instance, the modification of a Homeric line is stark, since *καναχή* is a relatively uncommon word, but one with a very precise range of meaning: denoting the clashing of teeth or wheels against the earth as well as the ringing of a helmet.¹⁶ Furthermore, ἔχω with *καναχή* as its object is a construction that appears only twice in the *Iliad* (elsewhere in Homer, *καναχή* appears only as the subject, *Od.* 6.82; *Il.* 19.365). In the two instances (both occurring in book 16) where this combination occurs, it characterizes the ringing of a warrior’s

15 Cf. Barker (1984, 40 n. 6), who notes that *καναχή* typically denotes a ‘clashing sound’ and draws attention to the designation of the *aulos*’ sound with the same term at Pind. *P.* 10.39. The sound of the *aulos* is also classified as a *καναχή* at Bacch. 2.12 and Soph. *Tr.* 212, and is likewise characterized with the adjective ἱμερόεις at *HH* 4.452. The relevance of *καναχή* to the sound of the *aulos* in particular is a topic that I intend to explore in a separate study.

16 Interestingly, as West (2007, 32) notes, the PIE root **kan* that is preserved in *καναχή* is also the root of the Latin *cano* and *carmen*. Thus whereas the Greek associates this word with noise, the same root has a distinctively musical inflection in Latin. See also Kaimio (1977, 105)’s comments on this use of the Homeric phrase, who dubs this a “wrong” use of the formula. That the cacophonous sense of *καναχή* (outside the context of the *aulos*) persists into the fifth century is confirmed by the contrast that Bacchylides develops in saying that the “clang of clashing bronze” and “festivities” (14.15 οὐτ’ ἐν θαλίαις καναχᾶ) do not “harmonize” (14.12f. ἀρμό-/ζει).

helmet when struck by blows (Ajax's at *Il.* 16.105) or as it rolls over the earth (Patroclus' at *Il.* 16.794).

That this description of Apollo's playing recalls a phrase in Homer that specifically refers to the sound of one hard object striking another highlights an additional significant aspect of ἔχει καναχήν: namely, that it represents the first extant reference to a plectrum.¹⁷ But unlike the ringing of the blow that signals Patroclus' impending doom (since this was the first time Achilles' helmet had ever been knocked to the ground, *Il.* 16.794-800), the καναχή that arises from the sweeping of the plectrum is 'charming' (ἱμερόεσσαν) because this blow animates the lyre's strings. But the juxtaposition of a conventional epithet for a song's loveliness (ἱμερόεσσαν) with a Homeric term for a distinctively violent sound in a combination that occurs nowhere else has the effect of drawing attention to the essentially noisy and tactile source of the lyre's sonority.¹⁸ Just as the phrase ἐρατὸς δοῦπος in the *Theogony* pinpointed the musicality of the sound of dancing feet, so too does καναχήν ἔχει ἱμερόεσσαν reveal an attention to the lyre's music as a sound distinct from the song it accompanies.

Further emphasis on the physicality of the performance comes from the portrayal of Apollo's dancing. Here, another pointedly Homeric word appears: 'Radiance beams around him, the flashing of his feet and the well-spun tunic' (202f. αἴγλη δέ μιν ἀμφιφαίνει / μαρμαρυγαί τε ποδῶν καὶ ἐυκλώστοιο χιτῶνος).¹⁹ The term μαρμαρυγή first appears in *Odyssey* 8.265, and there too it refers specifically to *dancing* feet: here the dance of the Phaeacians ('Then Odysseus marked the gleaming of their feet, and wondered in his heart; αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς / μαρμαρυγὰς θηεῖτο ποδῶν, θάύμαζε δὲ θυμῷ). As Leslie Kurke (2013, 154) has observed about this term, "These are the only two occurrences of the noun μαρμαρυγή in all of early hexameter, and they are deeply weird", and she points out that what is striking about this choice of word is the fact that it "properly denotes the 'glint' or 'gleam' of metal or highly polished crystalline stone" (ibid.). The attribution of this peculiarly shining appearance to Apollo's

17 On the techniques of playing the lyre with the plectrum see West (1992, 64-9). His comment on the utility of the plectrum for amplifying the lyre's sound is particularly apropos to its description in this passage, "a plectrum in itself produces a stronger and sharper sound than do bare fingers; and it appears to have been employed energetically" (68).

18 Cf. κρούειν and χρέκειν, both terms that beginning in the fifth century come to refer to the 'striking' of the lyre with the plectrum.

19 Cf. also the repetition of the phrase οἱ δὲ ῥήσσοντες ἔποντο at *HH* 3.516 to characterize the movements of the Cretans dancing in Apollo's procession, which recalls the use of ῥήσσοντες in a similarly choreographic context at *Il.* 18.571 (discussed above, n. 13). This allusion later in the *Hymn* to dancers "beating" in procession thus is of a piece with the violent undertones contained in the description of Apollo's playing as a kind of "clanging".

dancing feet in the *Hymn* thus suggests a parallelism with the metallic quality of the other accoutrements in the scene and the shiny appearance thereof: the 'golden plectrum' (185 χρυσέου ὑπὸ πλῆκτρον) and the 'lovely clanging' (καλαχῆν ἱμερόεσσαν) of the lyre. The metallic ringing of the instrument and the gleaming of his dancing feet thus cohere into single sound and spectacle as he does both at once as 'he plays, stepping beautifully and high' (201f. ἐγκιθαρίζει / καλὰ καὶ ὕψι βιβάζ). By re-combining two Homeric words with such specific meanings in this unique way, the poet of the *Homeric Hymn* conceptualizes Apollo's divine music in terms of a synaesthetic harmony between the 'clanging' acoustic quality of his lyre and the metallic-like radiant gleam of his dancing feet.

The passages discussed in this section, with their shared vocabulary of clamorous noise and beautiful music, thus underscore how music is in essence simply a combination of sounds, including noisy, violent ones like the clangs and bangs that populated the Homeric epics. When such sounds are produced by divine voices, feet, and instruments, however, they take on the markedly different aesthetic qualities of loveliness and beauty that distinguish music from cacophonous noise. At the same time, though, the novel and paradoxical word combinations that appear within these passages, which push the available vocabulary of sound to the very limits of its intelligibility, simultaneously confront the possibility that what is musical about music may in fact elude precise expression in language.

Indeed, the ineffability of song is what Hesiod targets in his characterization of the Muses' gift with ἀθέσφατος in the *Works and Days* (662), 'For the Muses taught me to sing unutterable song' (Μοῦσαι γὰρ μ' ἐδίδαξαν ἀθέσφατον ὕμνον ἀείδειν), where the epithet ἀθέσφατος connotes song so beautiful that not even a god could capture its loveliness. It is significant that this term equates the beauty of song with its inexpressibility in *any* language, not even that of a god, because this suggests that words for sounds may themselves run the risk of becoming meaningless noise precisely in the attempt to circumscribe music into language. In the next section, therefore, I want to consider a text in which the phenomenon of musico-linguistic aporia comes to the fore: namely, in Hermes' creation of the lyre in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*.

2 Musical and Poetic Innovations in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*

While the passages discussed so far have relied to a certain extent on novelty in word usage or neologism to target particular, unique aspects of the music they characterize, the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* capitalizes on this effect because it deals specifically with musical innovation: Hermes' invention of

the lyre. Widely recognized to be a later composition than the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (since the hymn to Hermes contains numerous parallels that suggest its influence),²⁰ this work, in comparison with the hymns to Apollo, Aphrodite, and Demeter, also includes the highest number of words not found elsewhere in the early hexameter corpus.²¹ Unsurprisingly, several such new words appear in this *Hymn's* accounts of Hermes' new musical instrument and so create an isomorphism between the novelty of the lyre's sound and the innovative terms used to characterize it. And while the presence of such unconventional language is in part due to the lighthearted, comic nature of the hymn, the diction the hymn adopts in relation to music is nonetheless significant because of the extent to which it balances unusual phrases or imagery with more conventional and familiar terminology. Since a significant part of this hymn is devoted to the invention and experience of a novel musical form, it is therefore these passages that develop the most extensive confrontation in archaic poetry between musical sound and lyric language.²²

The lyre's music is first heard immediately after Hermes' construction of the instrument from the shell of a tortoise. But prior to this moment, Hermes' response upon first glimpsing the animal, his burst of laughter (29 ἀθρήσας ἐγέλασσε), reveals his intent to transform the living animal into an instrument, as Stephen Halliwell (2008, 101) has interpreted this mirth:

Laughter externalises the delight of a deity who will draw music from a mute object of nature, just as, later in the hymn, it will externalise the leap of joy felt by Apollo (subsequently the supreme exponent of the lyre himself) when he hears the sounds produced by Hermes' new instrument.

In other words, Hermes derives pleasure from his recognition that he can turn the animal's shell into a vehicle for song (37f. μάλα καλὸν / ἀείδοις, 'you will sing very beautifully'), and this emphasis on transformation (here, specifically, the transformation of the dead tortoise into a singer) articulates a theme that will continue to recur in the later passages devoted to the lyre's sound.

20 Vergados (2013, 70-3) offers the most recent argument in support of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes'* indebtedness to the *Hymn to Apollo*, and see also Richardson (2010, 20f.), who also provides a synopsis of the major bibliography on this question.

21 For comprehensive lists of these words see Vergados (2013, 32-7). On the diction of the *Hymns* see also the summaries in Richardson (2010, 15f., 23f.) as well as their respective treatments in Janko 1982.

22 Taking a different approach, Vergados (2013, 26-39 and passim) elaborates the comic implications of the language used in this hymn.

The hymn then narrates each step of the lyre's construction as Hermes adds stalks of reed, oxhide, and strings to the shell (47-51) and adumbrates each element of the instrument and its humble origins in animal matter: not only the tortoise's shell, but the oxhide that covers it (49) as well as its seven sheep gut strings (51).²³ The characterization of this last element is particularly significant (51 ἐπτά δὲ συμφώνους δῖων ἐτανύσσατο χορδάς, 'He stretched seven strings of sheep's guts to sound in concord'), because the strings are said to 'sound in concord' (συμφώνους).²⁴ This is the first time that the adjective συμφώνους appears, and that the literal expression of the idea of 'sounding together' (σύν + φωνή) first appears in a passage depicting the lyre's creation well illustrates the phenomenon being described in these verses: namely, a new way of articulating sound. This form of articulation is derived from the lyre's physical construction on the one hand and, on the other hand, from the narrator's insertion of an adjective without any extant precedents to describe this new method of producing sound.

The emphasis on the nuts and bolts of the lyre form a contrast with the powerful sound that it eventually issues. When Hermes first strums it, it 'rings out awesomely' (54 σμερδαλέον κονάβησε). Not only does Hermes transfigure the dead tortoise into a vehicle for impressive sound, the narrator likewise transfigures a Homeric phrase into a description of musical acoustics, a phrase that in Homer had instead designated the ships echoing back the clamor of the Achaeans in *Iliad* 2 (334, cf. *Il.* 16.277) and the piercing sobs of Odysseus' men at *Odyssey* 10 (399).²⁵ Moreover, like the phrase *καναχὴν ἔχει* in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (185), which characterized the lyre's sound with the terms that Homer had applied to the ringing of a helmet beneath a blow, *σμερδαλέον κονάβησε* in Homer depicts the sound of Periphetes' helmet crashing against the earth

23 On the significance of the *Hymn's* specification of seven strings in light of the ancient testimony concerning Terpander's modifications to the instrument, see especially Barker 1984, 43 n. 18. For a detailed discussion of the technical musical language utilized in this hymn see Franklin 2003.

24 While this is the word transmitted in the MSS, Antigonus of Carystus supplied *θηλυτέρων* in its stead (ch. vii Keller). Although the most recent editions of the hymn print *συμφώνους*, see Vergados 2007 for an argument against this reading that emphasizes how the prominence of this term in later musical treatises may account for its appearance here. While it is unlikely that it has any technical sense here of 'concordance' (although cf. Franklin 2003, who argues in support of this view), there is no reason why it cannot refer simply and literally to the sound of multiple strings sounding simultaneously as Hermes sweeps the plectrum across it.

25 Cf. its appearance at Hes. *Th.* 840, where it refers to the earth's clamoring beneath Zeus' thunder and lightning.

as he falls under Hector's advance (*Il.* 15.648, cf. *Il.* 21.593, where the ringing is that of a shin greave). Like the other re-workings of Homeric sound terminology discussed above, then, the re-contextualization of this phrase in the lyre's acoustics, occupying the same line position in which it always appeared in Homer, conveys the piercing quality of the instrument's sound as well as its awe-inspiring effect by implying that its sound, as it is played for the very first time, is as striking as its Homeric precedents. This description of the lyre's construction and its first sound thus combines the use of a new compound on the one hand (*συμφώνους*) and the recycling of a markedly Homeric phrase on the other (*σμερδαλέον κονάβησε*).

Hermes goes on to sing a song detailing the circumstances of his own birth, and the improvisatory nature of this tune is compared to the sort of material that 'young men produce at feasts, mocking each other with taunts' (55f. *ἤϋτε κοῦροι / ἤβηται θαλίησι παραιβόλα κερτομέουσιν*).²⁶ In spite of the newness of its sound, Hermes is instantly able to assimilate his creation to a well-known style of singing. The contents and style of this song, however, differ markedly from the performance that Hermes will give for Apollo, since this one is a formal theogony bearing similarity to Hesiod's *Theogony*.²⁷ And unlike Hermes' first song, the second he performs with the express purpose of mollifying Apollo's anger at Hermes' theft of his cattle: 'Very easily, as he himself desired, he softened the glorious son of Leto for all his toughness' (416-18 *Λητοῦς δ' ἐρικυδέος υἱὸν / ρεῖα μάλ' ἐπρήυνεν ἐκηβόλον, ὥς ἔθελ' αὐτός, / καὶ κρατερόν περ ἐόντα*). But before Hermes even begins to sing, several verses detail Apollo's response to the sound of the lyre alone, and this description is significant for two reasons: 1) because of its parallels with the *Hymn*'s earlier portrayal of Hermes' song; and 2) because of its rapid and dense accumulation of Homeric phraseology (419-23):

πλήκτρῳ ἐπειρήτιζε κατὰ μέρος: ἦ δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς
σμερδαλέον κονάβησε: γέλασσε δὲ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
γῆθήσας, ἐρατὴ δὲ διὰ φρένας ἦλυθ' ἰωή
θεσπεσίης ἐνοπῆς καὶ μιν γλυκὺς ἥμερος ἦρει
θυμῷ ἀκουάζοντα.

26 This and all subsequent translations of the *Hymn* are from the edition of West 2003. On Hermes' song here as a 'mirror text' for the hymn, see especially Vergados 2013, 9-11.

27 See Vergados (2013, 5-7) for detailed analysis of the similarities between Hermes' and Hesiod's theogonies as well as on the differences between Hermes' first song and his second.

He tried it out with a plectrum in a tuned scale, and it rang out awesomely under his hand; and Phoibos Apollo laughed for pleasure, the lovely sound of its wondrous voice invaded his senses, and sweet longing captivated his heart as he listened.

First, the repetition of the Homeric phrase ‘resounded awesomely’ (σμερδαλέον κονάβησε) creates a resonance not only with its Homeric precedents but also with the previous appearance of this formula earlier in the hymn (54). That Apollo laughs in delight upon this first hearing amplifies this parallel, since it recalls Hermes’ mirth upon seeing the tortoise. While the latter laughed because of his idea to transform it, the fact that Apollo does so here reflects Hermes’ success at doing so, since the tortoise in its new form as the lyre is thus able to change the god’s anger to delight (421 γηθήσας). But the evocation of laughter from an ‘awesome resounding’ also occurs in *Odyssey* 17, where σμερδαλέον κονάβησε characterizes the noise of Telemachus’ sneeze (17.542). While this causes Penelope to laugh aloud and so suggests that the use of σμερδαλέον κονάβησε in this episode is also for comic effect, Telemachus’ sneeze is also more significant in the sense that it is portentous, coming as it does in response to Penelope’s assertion that Odysseus would take vengeance on the suitors if he were present (540f.). The re-use of this combination in the *Hymn*, then, may contain a similar duality of the playful and serious, signaling the delightful nature of the lyre’s sound while at the same time emphasizing the profundity of Apollo’s experience of hearing the lyre for the very first time.²⁸ For the fact that the lyre is traditionally associated with Apollo, not Hermes, not only imparts humor to this scene, but also suggests that σμερδαλέον κονάβησε is meant to have the same portentous quality as it did in *Odyssey* 17 by foreshadowing Apollo’s eventual adoption of the lyre from Hermes and the powers of prophecy that are allotted to Hermes in return (527-68).

The remaining details of Apollo’s response to the lyre’s sound indicate that he recognizes the sound as a distinctively musical one even before Hermes begins to sing. This is clear from the allusions to his feelings of joy (421 γηθήσας) as well as desire (422 μιν γλυκύς ἕμερος ἥρει, 434 τὸν δ’ ἔρος ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀμήχανος αἶνυτο θυμόν) and his perception of the sound as divine (θεσπεσίης ἔνοπής),

28 Vergados (2013, 52) characterizes this as a “humorous application of a formulaic phrase” and compares it to Sophocles’ depiction of the satyrs’ fear of the newly-created lyre in the *Ichneutae* (136-75). I would emphasize that parodies of epic terms for sound nevertheless offer valuable insight as to the connotations of such terms, since the comic effect of such parodies depend on an audience’s familiarity with the different vocabulary and images with which poets habitually conceptualized sound and music.

since these reflect typical criteria for archaic song and amalgamate traditional phraseology for music's loveliness (cf. *Il.* 2.599f. ἀοιδὴν / θεσπεσίην, *Od.* 23.144f. ἐν δὲ σφισιν ἵμερον ὦρσε / μολπῆς).²⁹ And the song that Hermes goes on to sing takes us further into familiar territory, since this theogony closely imitates the song of the Muses depicted in Hesiod's *Theogony*. Thus while the contents as well as the affective character of Hermes' song assimilate it to the musical performances depicted in earlier poetic works, the strangeness of the lyre's sound elicits Apollo's wonder, *thauma*, and is the element that defies conventional characterization.

The effect of this amalgamation of well-known musical vocabulary is to set in relief the peculiarity of the language depicting the lyre's sound. First, there is the terminology of *thauma*, which proliferates in earlier works, and Homer in particular, as a way to describe amazing *visual* phenomena. But apart from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, where the Delian Maidens constitute a 'great wonder' (156 μέγα θαῦμα) and the *Theogony*, where Typhon's monstrous voices are 'wondrous to hear' (834 θαύματ' ἀκούσαι), *thauma* is nowhere else attributed specifically to music, and here Apollo uses it not once, but three times to communicate the lyre's effects (439-57):

νῦν δ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ, πολύτροπε Μαιάδος υἱέ,
 ἦ σοί γ' ἐκ γενετῆς τάδ' ἅμ' ἔσπετο θαυματὰ ἔργα (440)
 ἡέ τις ἀθανάτων ἡέ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
 δῶρον ἀγαυὸν ἔδωκε καὶ ἔφρασε θέσπιν ἀοιδήν;
 θαυμασίην γὰρ τήνδε νηέφατον ὅσσαν ἀκούω,
 ἦν οὐ πῶ ποτέ φημι δαήμεναι οὔτε τιν' ἀνδρῶν
 οὔτε τιν' ἀθανάτων, οἳ Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσι, (445)
 νόσφι σέθεν, φηλήτα, Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱέ.
 τίς τέχνη, τίς μοῦσα ἀμηχανέων μελεδόνων,
 τίς τρίβος; ἀτρεκέως γὰρ ἅμα τρία πάντα πάρεστιν,
 εὐφροσύνην καὶ ἔρωτα καὶ ἥδυμον ὕπνον ἐλέσθαι.
 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Μοῦσῃσιν Ὀλυμπιάδεσσιν ὀπηδός, (450)
 τῇσι χοροὶ τε μέλουσιν καὶ ἀγλαὸς οἶμος ἀοιδῆς
 καὶ μολπὴ τεθαλυῖα καὶ ἱμερόεις βρόμος αὐλῶν:

29 Cf. the use of ἐνοπή at *Il.* 10.13 to describe the sound of the *aulos* and *syrinx* (αὐλῶν συρίγγων τ' ἐνοπήν), where this sound is decidedly not a pleasant one for Agamemnon to perceive, thus forming a marked contrast to Apollo's feelings of pleasure at the lyre's sound. Many thanks to the anonymous reviewer for alerting me to the Iliadic passage. On the different kinds of aesthetic responses associated with music and poetry in archaic and classical thought see especially Peponi 2012, as well as Walsh 1984.

ἀλλ' οὐ πω τί μοι ᾧδε μετὰ φρεσὶν ἄλλο μέλησεν,
οἶα νέων θαλίῃς ἐνδέξια ἔργα πέλονται.
θαυμάζω, Διὸς υἱέ, τὰδ', ὥς ἔρατὸν κιθαρίζεις. (455)
νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ὀλίγος περ ἔων κλυτὰ μῆδεα οἶδας,
ἴξε, πέπον, καὶ μῦθον ἐπαίνει πρεσβυτέροισι.

But now tell me this, the resourceful son of Maia: did these marvelous accomplishments attend you from birth, or did some god or mortal give you this remarkable gift and teach you wondrous singing? For this is a marvelous new-uttered voice I am hearing, that I declare no man and none of the immortals dwelling in Olympus has ever yet known, apart from you, deceitful son of Zeus and Maia. What is the skill, what art of these baffling diversions, what the method? For truly, this lets one enjoy three boons all together, good cheer, love, and sweet sleep. I too, you know, am a follower of the Olympian Muses, whose concerns are dancing and the splendid course of song, and lively music, and the captivating bray of the flutes. Yet I have never thought of anything else like this—like the passing to the right at young men's feasts. I am amazed, son of Zeus, how beautifully you can play such things on the lyre. Well, seeing that you are so clever, small as you are, pray sit there and acknowledge what your elders say.

The newness of the lyre thus plays a critical role in ensuring Hermes' success at mollifying Apollo, since among the many powerful emotions evoked in Apollo by Hermes' song, it is the sound of the lyre, and *only* the sound of the lyre, that Apollo repeatedly cites as the source of his 'wonder,' *thauma* (440 θαυματὰ ἔργα, 443 θαυμασίην ὄσσαν, 455 θαυμάζω).³⁰ Apollo's repetition of *thauma* terminology throughout this speech thus expresses his wonder as a kind of refrain, counterbalanced by the word that Apollo coins to refer to the newness and unfamiliarity of its sound: its 'new-uttered voice' (443 νεήφατον ὄσσαν). However, the fact that this term is not entirely original, but forms the logical counterpart to a compound used by Homer, *παλαίφατος*, 'said of old' (*Od.* 9.507, 13.172, 19.163), helps to define the poet of the *Hymn*'s voice as himself a harbinger of new sound: namely, the narrative of the lyre's origins.³¹

30 On *thauma* in the archaic Greek imagination see especially Hunzinger 1993, 1994, and 2015.

31 There is some ambiguity concerning the exact instrument that Hermes is supposed to invent in this hymn: is it supposed to be a general form of the lyre, or more particularly, the tortoiseshell lyre as distinct from the *cithara*? Franklin (2003) makes a case for the latter, but most commentators adhere to the former, especially since the rendition of this

In spite of, or perhaps because of, Apollo's puzzlement, he desires the instrument for himself: 'nothing like this has ever come to my mind before' (453 οὐ πω τί μοι ὦδε μετὰ φρεσὶν ἄλλο μέλησεν). While Apollo's focus is primarily on the strangeness of the lyre's sound, there is an obvious visual component that accounts for his wonder, as well. For as he highlights in saying 'small though you are' (456 ὀλίγος περ ἔων κλυτὰ μέδεα οἶδας), this performance is extraordinary not only because of its incorporation of a brand-new instrument, but also because it is the *baby* Hermes who displays such skill.³² Although this scene presents a comically exaggerated instance of a mismatch between sound and sight in musical performance, implicit in this remark of Apollo's is the expectation of a certain congruence between the appearance of a performer and the type of song that he produces.

Significantly, this hymn explicitly addresses the contrast between noise and music that has been only implicit in previous passages. This occurs in Hermes' instructions to Apollo, where he details how the lyre will only 'babble discordant rubbish' (488 μετήορά τε θρυλίζοι) unless it is played by a skilled hand (482-9):

ὅς τις ἄν αὐτὴν
τέχνη καὶ σοφίῃ δεδαημένος ἐξερεείνη,
φθεγγομένη παντοῖα νόῳ χαρίεντα διδάσκει
ῥεῖα συνηθείησιν ἄθυρομένη μαλακῇσιν, (485)
ἐργασίην φεύγουσα δυήπαθον: ὅς δέ κεν αὐτὴν
νῆϊς ἔων τὸ πρῶτον ἐπιζαφελῶς ἐρεείνη,
μὰ ψ αὐτῶς κεν ἔπειτα μετήορά τε θρυλίζοι.

If one questions her with skill and expertise, she speaks all kinds of lessons to charm the fancy, easily tickled with tender familiarity, avoiding tiresome effort. But if a novice questions her roughly, then she will utter useless, discordant rubbish.

Although Hermes expresses confidence that Apollo will gain the requisite expertise that very same day (466 σήμερον εἰδήσεις) to make the lyre a source of beautiful song, by drawing this distinction he nonetheless makes

story in Sophocles' *Ichneutae* (and in particular the satyrs' fright at the sounds they hear from Maia's cave) makes it clear that Hermes is envisioned as the inventor of string music writ large.

32 The fact that Hermes is still a baby is clearly a source of humor, as well. See especially lines 295-6, where Hermes farts in Apollo's arms.

it clear that the instrument is not inherently musical. And it is significant that the terms used to describe the noise the lyre will make if played badly, μετήορά τε θρυλίζοι, are both highly unusual.³³ While Homer uses the form μετέωρος to refer to something 'hanging high up,'³⁴ this is the first and only extant instance in which it appears in a musical context and so must be taken closely with θρυλίζοι. This verb is a *hapax*, but is clearly related to the verb that appears in later Attic sources to mean 'to chatter' or 'to babble,' θρυλέω. The sense of both terms is thus largely dependent on the context, and specifically on the contrast developed in the passage between the music created by a skilled player and the discordant sound evoked by someone who plays 'roughly' (ἐπιζαφελῶς) and tries to make music 'in vain' (μὲν αὖτως). Without this context, however, both words would be as unintelligible as the sounds they describe. Thus lyric language, like non-verbal sounds including that of the lyre itself, depends on a performer's skillful organization into a coherent whole in order to become meaningful.

3 Conclusions

The noisy or clamorous quality of the sound terms analyzed here offer two insights as to the nature of music and its relation to language. First, such words pinpoint the specific sounds (e.g. that of footfalls) or sound effects (e.g. echoing or resounding) that suggest an affinity between music and the more prosaic sounds that populate the environment outside of performance settings. In so doing, the essentially noisy nature of music is spotlighted. But as these descriptions have also intimated, the distinctively musical character of the performances portrayed here emerges from the aural *and* visual perception of these seemingly incongruous elements coming into concord, a feature that in turn underscores the importance of dance for visualizing sound as music. In sum, then, music is presented as the product of a skillfully-arranged composite of features that, individually, would not be recognizable as music.

Moreover, it is significant that the passages I have focused on here all depict the production of music at the hands of gods. In spite of Apollo's divinity, however, we saw above how Hermes emphasizes the skill necessary to play the lyre, even for a god. This feature of the *Hymn* thus underscores how even divine music reflects the great skill of its performers, skill that in turn makes it

33 Cf. Richardson 2010, *ad* 488.

34 *Il.* 8.26 and 23.369, and this is also the sense of the term earlier in the hymn, at 135, 'And straightaway he lifted them on high' (μετήορα δ' αἶψ' ἀνείρε).

seem as though sounds are being transfigured into music as if by magic. And the uncanniness that defines this kind of musical experience for an audience member is well expressed by the terminology of wonder, *thauma*, that appears so prominently in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*.

From the perspective of a literary historian, moreover, the attempts to capture the nuances of acoustics in these poems testify to a growing interest in the particulars of music's sound. Together they suggest that new ways of conceptualizing musical sound in the poetic imagination constitute a means of imparting novelty to the poem. This is particularly apparent in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, which takes to an extreme the experimentation with sound vocabulary that was already apparent in the *Theogony's* portrayal of the 'din' (δοῦπος) and 'echoing' (ἰάχω) of the Muses' song. In its numerous Homeric reworkings as well as its neologisms and *hapax legomena*, the hymn to Hermes suggests how poetic treatments of musicality, ones that take the form of novel ways of conceptualizing sound and music, help to reinforce the novelty of the poet's voice. This idea recalls Telemachus' claim in *Odyssey* 1: 'For men heap praise on the newest song that meets their ears' (351f. τὴν γὰρ αἰοδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ' ἄνθρωποι, / ἥ τις ἀκουόντεσσι νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται). As Armand D'Angour (2011, 186) has interpreted this apparent endorsement of musical novelty, it is also an assertion of the Homeric poet's innovativeness, "Through the mouth of Telemakhos, the composer draws attention to his own choice of theme and its original treatment". Analogously, I would suggest, the new or unusual ways of capturing musical acoustics discussed in this study function as a way to showcase poetic originality in their depictions of some of the very same kinds of sounds that would have accompanied the poems' performance.³⁵

Bibliography

- Barker, A. 1984. *Greek Musical Writings I* (Cambridge).
 Barker, A. 2002. *Words for Sounds*, in: Tuplin, C., Rihll, T.E. (eds.) *Science and Mathematics in Ancient Greek Culture* (Oxford), 22-35.

35 A version of this paper was initially presented at the 147th annual meeting of the Society for Classical Studies in January 2016 as part of a panel on "Music and the Emotions," sponsored by the International Society for the Study of Greek and Roman Music and its Cultural Heritage (MOISA). I am deeply grateful to the organizers, Pauline LeVen and Eirene Visvardi, as well as to the other members of the panel and the audience members for their valuable feedback. I also thank the anonymous reviewer and the editors of *Greek and Roman Musical Studies* for their very helpful comments and suggestions.

- Bettini, M. 2008. *Voci. Antropologia sonora del mondo antico* (Torino).
- Butler, S. 2015. *The Ancient Phonograph* (New York).
- Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots* (Paris).
- Cook, N. 1990. *Music, Imagination, and Culture* (Oxford).
- D'Angour, A. 2011. *The Greeks and the New. Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience* (Cambridge).
- Franklin, J. 2003. *The Language of Musical Technique in Greek Epic Diction*, *Gaia* 7, 295-307.
- Furley, W. 2011. *Homeric and Un-Homeric Hexameter Hymns: A Question of Type*, in: Faulkner, A. (ed.) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford), 206-31.
- Goddard, M., Halligan, B., Hegarty, P. 2012. *Introduction*, in: Goddard, M., Halligan, B., Hegarty, P. (eds.) *Reverberations: The Philosophy, Aesthetics, and Politics of Noise* (London/New York), 1-11.
- Gurd, S. 2016. *Dissonance: Auditory Aesthetics in Ancient Greece. Idiom: Inventing Writing Theory* (New York).
- Halliwell, S. 2002. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis. Ancient Texts and Modern Problems* (Princeton).
- Hunzinger, C. 1993. *L'étonnement et l'émerveillement chez Homère. Les mots de la famille de thauma*, *REG* 106, 506-8, pl. XVII-XIX.
- Hunzinger, C. 1994. *Le plaisir esthétique dans l'épopée archaïque: les mots de la famille de θαῦμα*, *BAGB* 1, 4-30.
- Hunzinger, C. 2015. *Thauma*, in: Destrée, P., Murray, P. (eds.) *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics* (Chichester), 422-37.
- Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns. Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge).
- Kaimio, M. 1977. *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature* (Helsinki).
- Kurke, L. 2013. *Imagining Chorality: Wonder, Plato's Puppets, and Moving Statues*, in: Peponi, A.-E. (ed.) *Performance and Culture in Plato's Laws* (Cambridge), 123-70.
- Lather, A. *Pindar's Water Music: The Acoustics and Dynamics of the Kelados*. Forthcoming in CP.
- Peponi, A.-E. 2012. *Frontiers of Pleasure: Models of Aesthetic Response in Archaic and Classical Greek Thought* (Oxford).
- Richardson, N. 2010. *Three Homeric Hymns* (Cambridge).
- Richardson, N. 2011. *Reflections of Choral Song in Early Hexameter Poetry*, in: Athanassaki, L., Bowie, E. (eds.) *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (Berlin/Boston), 15-32.
- Stanford, W. 1967. *The Sound of Greek. Studies in the Greek Theory and Practice of Euphony* (Berkeley/Los Angeles).
- Stanford, W. 1969. *The Lily Voice of the Cicadas* (*Iliad* 3.152), *Phoenix* 23, 3-8.

- Stanford, W. 1981. *Sound, Sense, and Music in Greek Poetry*, G&R 28, 127-40.
- Varese, E., Wen-chung, C. 1966. *The Liberation of Sound*, Perspectives of New Music 5, 11-9.
- Vergados, A. 2007. *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes 51 and Antigonus of Carystus*, CQ n.s. 52, 737-42.
- Vergados, A. 2013. *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes. Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Berlin).
- Walsh, G. 1984. *The Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry* (Chapel Hill).
- West, M.L. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).
- West, M.L. 2003. *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer* (Cambridge, MA).



BRILL

GREEK AND ROMAN MUSICAL STUDIES 5 (2017) 147–158

GREEK
AND ROMAN
MUSICAL
STUDIES

brill.com/grms

Vox Naturae

Music as Human-Animal Communication in the Context of Animal Training in Ancient Rome

Rodney Martin Cross, MRes.

Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

rodney.cross@hdr.mq.edu.au

rodneymcross@gmail.com

Abstract

In the context of animal training, music and sound that function as auditory cues can enable communication from humans to animals. This paper will present two case studies that emphasise the extensive influence of music in the practice of ‘animal training’ in an ancient Roman context. In the first case study, Varro records the practice of swineherds training their animals to respond to the sound of a *bucina* (Varro *Rust.* 2.4.20), and in the second, Aelian describes the training practices of dancing elephants that performed at a spectacle orchestrated by Germanicus (Ael. *NA* 2.11). This paper assesses the veracity of these two case studies by exploring their ethological underpinnings.

Keywords

ancient music – sound – animal training – auditory cues – associative learning

The use of music and musical sounds as auditory cues in the practice of animal training provides a distinct perspective to the perceived influence of human music¹ on animals in the ancient Roman world. While cues can take the form of visual, tactile or auditory stimuli (Wilson 2013, 430), the use of auditory or vocal cues in herding and training animals is extremely common as it facilitates communication over greater distances. One must only think of a farmer

1 Hereafter for the purpose of this study, simply ‘music’.

whistling to their dog to find such an example. Indeed there are a number of similar instances in ancient Greek and Roman texts that attest to the use of whistling as an auditory cue. In a mythical setting, Homer attests that with one loud whistle the cyclop Polyphemus 'turned his fat flocks toward the mountain' (Hom. *Od.* 9.307; transl. Murray 1919). Plutarch similarly describes the communication of orders to animals through use of a 'mere casual whistle or clucking of the tongue' (Plut. *De gen. Socr.* 593b10-c1; transl. De Lacy and Einarson 1959). Claudian also provides an analogy comparing the joyous response of soldiers at the sight of their general, to a herd of cattle eagerly making for the 'sound of the ox-herd's well-known song or whistle' (Claud. *De bello gothico* 26.406-12; transl. Platnauer 1922). Music and auditory cues enable a direct avenue for human-animal communication, which is invaluable in both the herding and training of various species of animals.

This paper will provide an investigation into two distinct case studies that focus on the active presence of music and aural cues in a context of animal training. By exploring their ethological underpinnings this paper assesses the veracity of these two selected case studies. Through this investigation we may gain insight not only into the ancient authors' perceptions of the relationship between music and animals, but also more specifically about certain practices of animal training in an ancient Roman context.² The first case study evaluates excerpts from Varro and Polybius that attest to the use of Roman brass instruments in swine herding in Corsica and the Italian mainland. The ancient evidence of this case study will be considered in relation to modern training practices, and several animal behavioural studies relating to the differentiation of auditory cues by *Sus scrofa domestica*, the domestic pig. This comparison of ancient and modern accounts can provide further insight into the change and continuation of training practices throughout history.

The second case study will examine an account in Aelian's *On the Characteristics of Animals* that focusses on the training practices and trained behaviours of dancing elephants that performed in a spectacle orchestrated by Germanicus. Both the role of music and the training practices recorded in this case study differ fundamentally from the first, which offers an important point of contrast and adds depth to the investigation of auditory cues in a training context. This

2 This is not to say that music as human-animal communication in the Greco-Roman world is limited exclusively to these two examples. One of many further examples includes the practices of ancient horse-training. Aelian characterises horses as 'musical' animals (Ael. *NA* 15.25, 12.44) and notes the specific training of Sybarite horses to dance (Ael. *NA* 16.23; cf. Plin. *HN* 8.157). For significant publications on the human-animal communication with horses and their training practices in antiquity, cf. Anderson 1961; Cherchi 2012; Georgoudi 1990.

study will focus primarily on the identification of the possible training methods used, the role of auditory cues within these methods and the rhythmical responses of the elephants to music. Once again, the comparative use of texts on modern animal training practices is essential in evaluating the influence of music and auditory cues in the training processes described by Aelian.

1 Pavlov's Dog and Varro's Pigs

When we consider the references presented by Varro and Polybius, music serves a central role in aspects of animal training and domestication, primarily in the production of auditory cues that act as a method of human-animal communication. Varro notes the process of training pigs to associate such auditory cues, in this case a Roman brass instrument, the *bucina*, with barley. Varro notes that:

the swineherd should accustom them to do everything to the sound of the horn [*bucina*]. At first they are penned in; and then when the horn sounds [*bucina*], the sty is opened so that they can come out into the place where barley is spread out ... This idea in having them gather at the sound of the horn [*bucina*] is that they might not become lost when scattered into wooded country.

VARRO *RUST.* 2.4.20; TRANSL. HOOPER AND ASH 1934

This account demonstrates a process of associative learning in these piglets, whereby the sound of the *bucina* becomes associated with the presence of food. This process of conditioning was a primary research focus of Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov, whose experiments studying salivary conditioning on dogs at the end of the 19th Century were instrumental in understanding associative learning in animals (Schwartz 1984, 25). To briefly provide some context and highlight the relevance to Varro's account, I will reproduce a definition of classical conditioning from Paul McGreevy and Robert Boakes' text on animal training practices:

Classical conditioning is "a training procedure in which some initially neutral stimulus (conditioned stimulus or CS; e.g. a sound of low to moderate intensity) is paired with a response-eliciting event (unconditioned stimulus or US; e.g. food) with the frequent result that the CS comes to elicit the same or a related response."

MCGREEVY AND BOAKES 2007, 285

In the case of Varro's pigs, the neutral, conditioned stimulus of the sound of the *bucina* became associated with the unconditioned stimulus, barley, which elicited a physical response from the pigs; they would eagerly gather at the sound, waiting to be fed. When we assess Varro's account in this way it is clear that Varro was, albeit unknowingly, recording classical conditioning techniques that were to predate Pavlov's study of associative learning in animals by almost 2000 years.

Polybius, who provides justification for the initial development of the practice, further expands on the specific details of these conditioning techniques used in ancient Roman swineherding. According to Polybius, Corsica's thickly wooded and rocky terrain prevented more traditional methods of herding, as it was almost impossible for herdsmen to follow behind their animals (Polyb. 12.2.4.1-3). These Corsican herdsmen developed a practice of training their animals to come to the sound of their herdsman's *salpinx*, which allowed the flocks to wander at greater distances from their herdsman. The use of brass instruments in this context is not unexpected, as similar to their use in military signalling, the sound of brass instruments would have carried over much larger distances than the human voice or even other instruments associated with the Roman pastoral experience, such as the *syrinx*. According to Polybius the Italian swineherds 'invented the horn [*βυκάνη*] call as the simplest method of separating [droves of piglets] ... without labour or trouble when the litters had become mixed' (Polyb. 12.2.4.11; transl. Scott-Kilvert 1979).³ Supposedly swineherds would train piglets by litter to respond to distinct trumpets so that:

whenever one of the swineherds leads off in one direction sounding his horn [*βυκάνη*], and another turns away in another direction, the animals separate of their own accord and follow with such eagerness the sound of [each] individual horn [*βυκάνη*].

POLYB. 12.2.4.11-13; TRANSL. SCOTT-KILVERT 1979

From these sources we learn three important points about the animals themselves that can actually be supported, to some extent, by existing modern animal behavioural studies, that: 1) pigs show they have a considerable propensity for associative learning, 2) pigs can be effectively trained to respond to the production of specific *auditory* cues, and 3) that pigs have the ability to differentiate

3 Polybius compares the use of brass instruments in Corsica for swineherding with practices on the Italian mainland and notably differentiates between the Corsican *salpinx* and the *βυκάνη* (*bucina*), which was used by the Italian swineherds.

between aurally similar auditory cues, more specifically the sounds of distinct *bucinae/salpinges*.

Prior to evaluating these key points in relation to modern animal behavioural examples, it may be of benefit to briefly address the terminological issues present across Varro and Polybius' accounts. For the description of Corsican herding practices Polybius uses the distinct term *salpinx*, often used to denote a straight, bronze Greek trumpet, closely associated with the Roman *tuba* (Ziolkowski 1999, 369). The term *salpinx* however can also be applied more generally across contexts in the same way that the English term 'horn' could be used interchangeably for a number of modern brass instruments. In fact, Ziolkowski notes (1999, 369) that "Greek historians referring to Roman affairs use the term *salpinx* and vice versa". Unfortunately in instances such as this, the general use of the term can prevent a clear contextual understanding of the specific nature of the instrument. Pliny does note the use of *tubae* made from elderwood by shepherds, which could provide a possible description of the type of *salpinx* used by Corsican herdsman (Plin. *HN* 16.179). The term *βυξάνη*, which Polybius uses in reference to Italian practices, seems to be used as an equivalent of the Roman *bucina*. Polybius' contextual use of the term would reasonably suggest an instrument made of bovine material as described by Vegetius (2.23.2).⁴

Having identified these issues we may now proceed to an examination of two contemporary examples in which domestic pigs are trained to complete basic tasks through the use of solely auditory cues. In the first instance Charlie, a Vietnamese pot-bellied pig (*Sus scrofa*) is taught to unroll a carpet on the auditory cue 'carpet', and is trained to do so by placing pig pellets within the rolled-up carpet, which prompts the pig to unroll it with its snout to find the food (McGreevy and Boakes 2007, 127-8). In the second example Bruno, a Chinese pot-bellied pig (*Sus scrofa*) is taught to fetch a stick using the command 'fetch', and is rewarded with pig pellets, apples or scratches (McGreevy and Boakes 2007, 129-31). In both cases it is to be noted that before beginning the training the animal "must learn to associate the reinforcer [unconditioned stimuli] ... with the training context" (McGreevy and Boakes 2007, 129). According to one trainer, unsurprisingly, a pig's "love for food makes them reasonably easy to motivate" (McGreevy and Boakes 2007, 129).

On Polybius' claim that the swine could differentiate between the sound of the herdsman's horns, the specific organology of the instruments may support

4 Noting importantly Renato Meucci's (1989, 85-6) invaluable amendment to Vegetius' text in the use of the terms *cornu* and *bucina*.

this description.⁵ If we consider Varro's *bucina* to be an instrument made of horn, the distinction between pitches would have been quite obvious. Animal horns of differing sizes result in very distinct pitches: the larger the horn, the lower the pitch, and a smaller instrument resulting in a higher pitch. This would, to an extent, support Polybius' assertion that the pigs could differentiate between these distinct auditory cues with considerable ease. Considering the possibility of more aurally similar cues however, several recent animal behavioural studies also highlight the keen senses of pigs and imply they may have the capacity to differentiate between seemingly identical sounds and frequencies. A recent study suggests that mother pigs have a keen ability to distinguish their own piglets from piglets of other litters based solely on the frequencies of their vocalizations (Illman et al. 2002). Another study similarly, that pigs can differentiate between juvenile litter mates based on a mix of visual, auditory and olfactory cues (McLeman et. al. 2008).

While the modern studies provided do seem to corroborate the animal behavioural characteristics depicted in the accounts of Varro and Polybius in relation to both the associative learning of swine and their ability to distinguish between specific aural cues, further study would certainly be of interest in this area. Research in associative learning in animals generally focuses on more general behavioural patterns across species, however in this instance a species-specific study would be of key benefit to research. I believe there is a unique opportunity for future ethological research specifically in testing the efficacy of Varro and Polybius' training methods of applying musical signals as auditory cues in the practice of pig-training, and in doing so providing further verification of these ancient accounts.

In contradistinction to Varro and Polybius' accounts, the presence of music in the training of Germanicus' dancing elephants varies distinctly, providing another dimension to the current investigation.

2 Aelian's Elephants and the 'Dancing Master'

Aelian in his work *On the Characteristics of Animals* provides many useful anecdotes of animal behaviours and, more importantly for the current work,

5 Differences in shape, size, material and construction influence the aural characteristics of all Roman brass instruments (*bucina*, *cornua*, *litui* and *tubae*). It is interesting to note that Vegetius records a similar occurrence by the Roman army, in which different sections of the army responded to the characteristic sounds of distinct brass instruments (the *tubae* with infantry and the *cornua* with the Roman standards) (Veg. *Mil.* 2.22).

a number of accounts relating to the influence of human music on animals.⁶ One of Aelian's most detailed accounts is his description of the trained elephants that performed in a spectacle dedicated by Germanicus (Ael. *NA* 2.11.ff).^{7,8} In this account Aelian notes some important details about the training process, most notably the actions and behaviours that the animals were taught to exhibit or to suppress, as well as some implications for the specific training practices.

Aelian states that elephants have a keen sense of music, an aptitude for learning and a readiness to obey commands (Ael. *NA* 2.11). Noting these general abilities Aelian lists behaviours that elephants have successfully learnt through various forms of animal training, which include 'the movements of a chorus, the steps of a dance, how to march in time, how to enjoy the sound of flutes (*auloi*), how to distinguish different notes, when to slacken pace ... or when to quicken at command' (Ael. *NA* 2.11; transl. Scholfield 1958). These behaviours were also learnt and exhibited by the twelve elephants of Germanicus' spectacle. Aelian asserts that these animals were born in Italy, and that when they reached a certain age a 'dancing master' (*orchestodidaskalos*)⁹ 'instructed them with uncanny and astounding dexterity' (Ael. *NA* 2.11; transl. Scholfield 1958). Below is an excerpt of Aelian's description of the methods and outcomes of the training:

To begin with he [the 'dancing master'] introduced them in a quiet, gentle fashion to his instructions supplying them with delicacies and the most appetising food, varied so as to allure and entice them into abandoning all trace of ferocity ... that is tame, and to some degree human. So what they learnt was not to go wild at the sound of the flutes (*aulos*), not to be alarmed at the beating of drums (*tympanon*), to be charmed by the pipe

6 Aelian is a rich source in this regard and provides a wealth of anecdotes attesting to the behavioural responses of specific animals to music (see for example *bees*: 5.13; *crabs*: 6.31; *sprats*: 6.32; *Libyan mares*: 12.44; *dolphins*: 12.45; *Etruscan boars and stags* 12.46; *stingrays* 17.18). Aelian's descriptions provide valuable avenues for further comparative ethological analyses.

7 Descriptions of Germanicus' spectacle appear in several other accounts (Plin. *HN* 8.4; Philo *De animalibus* 27; Plut. *De soll. an.* 968c), although of these, Aelian does provide the most detail. Pliny simply posits that 'at the gladiatorial show given by Germanicus Caesar some [elephants] even performed clumsy movements in figures, like dancers' (*HN* 8.2.5; transl. Rackham 1940).

8 Cassius Dio (56.27.5) places a spectacle held by Germanicus in 12 BCE although notably omits any mention of elephants.

9 Philo ascribes the name Baebius to the 'dancing master' (*De animalibus* 27).

(*syrinx*) and endure discordant notes, the beat of marching feet, and the singing of crowds ... they were not to get angry at the infliction of a blow.

AEL. NA 2.11; TRANSL. SCHOLFIELD, 1958

Similar to the swineherds in Varro and Polybius' accounts, the 'dancing master' relies on 'appetising food' as a key reinforcer for the elephants, and while not mentioned explicitly in relation to their training, their keen fondness for fragrant flowers (mentioned elsewhere in Aelian) may have been exploited by the trainer (Ael. NA 13.8). While the two case studies in this paper share a commonality in the use of food as a reinforcer, it is important to note the distinct forms of training present in Aelian's example. Rather than learning simply through a process of conditioning, the elephants in this account were trained to *endure* unpleasant or alarming sounds of the *aulos* and *tympanon*, essentially *suppressing* a natural response to an aversive stimulus.¹⁰ To achieve these learned behaviours these animals may have undergone a process of desensitisation, a process whereby an animal can become accustomed to an aversive stimulus by gradual habituation or counter-conditioning (Irwin et. al. 2013, 652). Habituation, considered to be a passive form of desensitisation, prompts the animal to become accustomed to a new stimulus through repeated exposure (Ramirez 2013, 426), whereas counter-conditioning takes a more active approach, in which the trainer "reinforces the animal while it is exposed to a new stimulus" (Ramirez 2013, 426). While Aelian does not provide enough specific detail to explicitly define the training methods, the trainer's introduction of quiet, gentle instructions before progressing to more rigorous training does seem to at least imply a gradual application of desensitisation methods.¹¹

In further contrast to the first study, the role of music as an auditory cue is notably less explicit. Music very clearly forms an integral part of the training process; however, as the training methods differ from the classical conditioning in Varro's account, so too does the role of music and auditory cues. Soothing notes of the *syrinx* may have been used by the trainer as a bridging stimulus or marker signal that function as a point of reference or focus for the animals during training (Wilson 2013, 419). These stimuli are most often auditory cues and can take the form of an easily recognisable sound, a whistle, or word such as "good" (Wilson 2013, 419) and are used "to indicate to an animal when it has

10 A similar process is briefly described by Aelian (NA 16.25) in relation to Persians training their horses to be accustomed to the loud, harsh sounds of war.

11 A striking comparison can be made to Aristoxenus' reported treatment of a man who could not bear the sound of the trumpet (Thphr. fr. 726A Fortenbaugh). Aristoxenus played the *aulos* and gradually increased the volume until the man could tolerate the feared trumpet sound. For a discussion of music as therapy in antiquity, cf. West 2000.

executed a desired behaviour correctly" (Ramirez 2013, 424). Aelian claims too that the elephants learnt to be 'charmed by the pipe', which strongly suggests that this response to the music was a learned behaviour (or at the very least a cultivation of an innate response), which would have been extremely beneficial to the trainer. When considering one of the desired modified behaviours was to not become enraged under physical stress or in response to aversive stimuli, the use of a calming or reinforcing auditory cue would have been invaluable.

Another point of focus in this case is the initial aversive response to *aulos* music, the beating of *tympanon* and discordant notes, subject to behaviour modification by the 'dancing master'. We know from a number of sources that elephants have a natural fear of the high-pitched squealing of pigs (Ael. *NA* 16.36; Plin. *HN* 8.1; Sen. *De Ira* 3.1.11.6) and even other loud musical signals including Roman brass instruments, both of which signify important weaknesses in their use in ancient warfare (*pigs*: Ael. *NA* 1.38; Plin. *HN* 8.9.28; *trumpets*: Flor. 2.13.67; Liv. 30.33.12; Polyb. 15.12). Bearing this natural aversion to certain sounds in mind, the timbral qualities of *auloi* music, particularly in an extremely high register (and allowing for the odd incidental squeak, not uncommon with double-reeded instruments), may have tapped into this seemingly innate biological aversion to particular, 'harsh' or 'abrasive' sounds. In this I believe I can sympathise with the elephants. Upon reflection, a choice between a herd of squealing pigs and a classroom full of thirty primary school students learning the recorder would be a challenging one indeed.

Finally we must not forget of course, the integral role of music in Germanicus' spectacle itself. Following the discussion of the learned behaviours exhibited by the elephants, Aelian provides an account of the spectacle, emphasising the keen sense of music exhibited by the elephants in their performance. According to Aelian once the elephants had become proficient at performing the trainer's 'choreography', they were called to perform at the spectacle. Aelian notes that:

they entered with a mincing gait, swaying their whole body in a delicate manner ... And at no more than a word from the conductor they formed into a line ... supposing that to have been their teacher's order. Then again they wheeled into a circle when he so ordered them ... they sprinkled flowers to deck the floor ... and now and again they stamped, keeping time in a rhythmical dance.

AEL. *NA* 2.11; TRANSL. SCHOLFIELD 1958¹²

12 Philo of Alexandria's account offers additional detail on the behaviour of the elephants imitating a Roman banquet, emphasising especially their perceived 'drunkenness' (*De animalibus* 27; transl. Terian 1981).

Noting the use of auditory cues in this section of the account, it appears that spoken/vocal cues were used primarily in the training of these behaviours in lieu of musical cues. The response of the elephants in ‘keeping time’ highlights an astutely musical response to the music of the scene. Philo also notes that the elephants ‘danced to the sweet music of men entertaining with trumpet and lyre’ (*De animalibus*, 27; transl. Terian 1981). Aelian takes the opportunity to discuss the musicality of elephants, and posits that the comprehension of melody and rhythm by these ‘inarticulate’ animals must surely be considered ‘gifts bestowed by Nature’ (Ael. *NA* 2.11; trans. Scholfield 1958). Despite some valid concerns on the reliability of Aelian’s account,¹³ the comparison of the musicality of these elephants as described in Aelian with modern training practices and animal behavioural studies suggests there may be some deeper truth to the narrative. Several Cognitive Biology studies suggest that elephants may be capable of what is known as rhythmical entrainment (Stoger and Manger 2014, 102; Schachner et. al. 2009). In fact, an Asian elephant (*Elephas maximus*) as a part of the Thai Elephant Orchestra has been witnessed maintaining a steady drum beat (Patel and Iversen 2006, 477). Similarly, these elephants are capable of playing pitched and non-pitched rhythm instruments and often sway rhythmically to the music (Patel and Iversen 2006, 477; Soldier 2006). Stoger and Manger note however that it remains unclear whether elephants “spontaneously match their movements to the beat, or whether the accompanying music was chosen advantageously” (Stoger and Manger 2014, 102).

3 Concluding Remarks

The two distinct case studies related in this work focussing on accounts from Varro and Polybius, and Aelian respectively, emphasise the strong influence of music on animals in these specific examples of animal training in an ancient Roman context. The role of music and musical sound as auditory cues notably differs between these two cases. In the accounts from Varro and Polybius we have seen, following a process of classical conditioning, the sounds of *bucinae* and *salpinges* acting as conditioned auditory cues, which enabled Corsican and Italian swineherds to more effectively herd their animals. Polybius also elabo-

13 Aelian asserts in his work that he prefers to state what he has himself seen or what has been recorded by others (*NA* 2.11). But of the extant texts referring to this event (see above n. 7) Aelian’s account is both the latest and most detailed. Abraham Terian (1981, 142) does however suggest a common primary source shared between Pliny’s and Aelian’s accounts, possibly tracing back to King Juba II of Mauretania (c. 50BCE-AD 23).

rates further and suggests that if properly trained from a young age, the pigs could differentiate between the sounds of distinct instruments, further assisting with separating large droves of piglets. This training facilitated greater human-animal communication allowing the herdsman to gather their animals from considerable distances. Further ethological research on this topic may be directed towards testing the efficacy of the use of musical signals in pig training, and in doing so provide further verification of these ancient accounts.

In contradistinction, Aelian's account of the dancing elephants of Germanicus' spectacle portrays a markedly distinct role for music and auditory cues in the training process. While Aelian provides less specific detail than the previous case study some aspects of the training process can be inferred from the ways in which the training was introduced in the narrative. The possible use of *syrix* music as a conditioned bridging stimulus, used to signify a completed action or facilitate more active desensitisation training, would have been an invaluable method of human-animal communication to the trainer. Another point of distinction is the process of desensitisation to aversive musical stimuli notably the sounds of the *aulos* and *tympanon*, either by means of habituation or counter-conditioning. The trained suppression of a natural response to music and sound provides an interesting dimension to an investigation into the influence of music on animals, as it suggests that role of music and sound in the practice of animal training can be modified and applied accordingly to encourage the desired trained behaviours.

The accounts of Varro and Polybius, and Aelian allow us to gain insight into the presence of music as a communicative tool in the relationship between humans and animals. These sources convey a considerable understanding of animal training practices and the extensive influence of music in this context, especially when compared in relation to modern training and animal behavioural texts.¹⁴

Bibliography

- Anderson, J. K. 1961. *Ancient Greek Horsemanship* (Berkeley).
 Cherchi, G. 2012. *Equus in fabula. Immagini del cavallo tra mito, arte e letteratura* (Pisa).
 De Lacy, P.H., Einarson, B. 1959. *Plutarch, Moralia* Volume 7, *On the Sign of Socrates* (Cambridge, Mass.).

14 With many thanks to the anonymous reviewer, and Eleonora Rocconi for their valuable feedback, and to the editors of *Greek and Roman Musical Studies*.

- Georgoudi, S. 1990. *Des chevaux et des boeufs dans le monde grec: réalités et représentations animalières à partir des livres XVI et XVII des 'Géoponiques'* (Paris/Athens).
- Hooper, W.D., Ash, H.B. 1934. *Cato and Varro, On Agriculture* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Illmann, G., Schrader, L., Špinka, M., Šustr, P. 2002. *Acoustical Mother-Offspring Recognition in Pigs (Sus Scrofa domestica)*, Behaviour 139.4, 487-505.
- Irwin, M.D., Stoner, J.B., Cobaugh, A.M. (eds.) 2013. *Zookeeping: An Introduction to the Science and Technology* (Chicago).
- McGreevy, P., Boakes, R. 2007. *Carrots and Sticks: Principles of Animal Training* (New York/Cambridge).
- McLeman, M.A., Mendl, M.T., Jones, R.B., Wathes, C.M. 2008. *Social Discrimination of Familiar Conspecifics by Juvenile Pigs, Sus scrofa: Development of a Non-Invasive Method to Study the Transmission of Unimodal and Bimodal Cues Between Live Stimuli*, Applied Animal Behaviour Science 115.3-4, 123-37.
- Meucci, R. 1989. *Roman military instruments and the lituus*, Galpin Society Journal, 85-97.
- Murray, A.T. 1919. *The Odyssey*, with an English translation in two volumes (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Patel, A., Iversen, J. 2006. *A Non-Human Animal Can Drum a Steady Beat on a Musical Instrument*, in: Baroni, M., Addressi, A.R., Caterina, R., Costa, M. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Music* (Bologna), 477.
- Platnauer, M. 1922. *Claudian, The Gothic War* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Rackham, H. 1940. *Pliny, Natural History*, Volume III: Books 8-11, (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Ramirez, K. 2013. *Husbandry Training*. in: Irwin, M.D., Stoner, J.B., Cobaugh, A.M. (eds.) *Zookeeping: An Introduction to the Science and Technology* (Chicago), 424-34.
- Schachner, A., Brady, T.F., Pepperberg, I.M., Hauser, M.D. 2009. *Spontaneous Motor Entrainment to Music in Multiple Vocal Mimicking Species*, Current Biology 19, 831-6.
- Scholfield, A. F. 1958. *Aelian, On Animals*, Volume I: Books 1-5, (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Schwartz, B. 1984. *Psychology of Learning and Behaviour* (New York).
- Scott-Kilvert, I. 1979. *Polybius: The Rise of the Roman Empire* (London).
- Soldier, D. 2006. *The Thai Elephant Orchestra*, in: Solisti, K., Tobias, M. (eds.) *Kinship with Animals* (London), 173-83.
- Stoeger, A.S., Manger, P. 2014. *Vocal Learning in Elephants: Neural Bases and Adaptive Context*, Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 28, 101-7.
- Terian, A. 1981. *Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus* (Chico, California).
- West, M.L. 2000. *Music Therapy in Antiquity*, in: Horden, P. (ed.) *Music as Medicine: The History of Music Therapy Since Antiquity* (Aldershot), 51-68.
- Wilson, G.L. 2013. *Operant Conditioning*, in: Irwin, M.D., Stoner, J.B., Cobaugh, A.M. (eds.) *Zookeeping: An Introduction to the Science and Technology* (Chicago), 416-24.
- Ziolkowski, J. 1999. *The Invention of the Tuba (Trumpet)*, CW 92.4, 367-73.



BRILL

GREEK AND ROMAN MUSICAL STUDIES 5 (2017) 159-177

GREEK
AND ROMAN
MUSICAL
STUDIES

brill.com/grms

A Voice without a Muse

Primates and the Ancient Phonosphere in Greek and Roman Cultures

Marco Vespa

Université Côte d'Azur / CEPAM (CNRS, UMR 7264)

Università degli studi di Siena / Centro Antropologia e Mondo Antico

marco.vespa@univ-cotedazur.fr

Abstract

Ancient sources often describe non-human primates as imitative animals, i.e., living beings able to reproduce, with different degrees of perfection, gestures and movements carried out by human beings. Indeed monkeys are often characterized as *mimeloi*, *mi-metikoi*, terms coming from the same semantic field of the noun *mimos* (< **mim-*).

But what about the world of sounds? Are non-human primates regarded as good imitators and performers also when it comes to music and singing? Ancient evidence clearly indicates that other animal species (like nightingales or partridges), and not monkeys, were mainly regarded as excellent singers worthy of imitation by human beings. Through a detailed analysis of ancient Greek sources, especially some passages in Galen, this paper aims at investigating why non-human primates were not considered good singers. In particular, this survey tries to shed a new light on some cultural associations, according to which the small and weak voice of monkeys (μικροφωνία) and the voice of other figures in ancient society (like actors, musicians, kids, eunuchs and so on) were described in a similar way.

Keywords

primates – imitation – voice quality – animal phonosphere – ancient medicine – gender – ancient Greek literature

My grateful thanks are due to Sabina Crippa, Eleonora Rocconi, and Christophe Vendries for reading and commenting on preliminary versions of this article. I gratefully acknowledge the support and generosity of the École française de Rome, without which the present study could not have been completed.

1 Introduction: Animal Voices in Context

In any language, the description of sounds and their mutual relations is a complex cultural construction. Sounds cannot be described as objective and neutral realities since they involve human perception: hence they are constantly screened through variable, culturally specific concepts or images. The terms depicting sound pitch may often derive from non-acoustic domains, as it happened in ancient Greek culture where *oxys* and *barys* ('high' and 'low', in terms of pitch) originally described the nature of a piercing object or its weight.¹

When we address the theme of animal voices in other societies, it is important to assess to what extent our perception of the animal phonosphere differs from theirs.² Even though Aristotle had already used the word *dialektos* with reference to some species of birds,³ only modern scholars of animal behaviour and psychology have begun to speak about voice, language and communication also in relation to animals, no longer conceiving these as exclusively human prerogatives.⁴ From a Greek perspective, human beings speak and articulate a discourse while animals can only give the impression of doing so, as Aristotle explicitly says when he uses the expression *hosper dialektos* to indicate a sort of 'illusion' of language. Hence, since *dialektos* is conceived as the most refined physiological process of vocal production, it should not be translated as 'language', a term with which we indicate a specifically cognitive phenomenon.⁵

1 "The old poetic associations of *oxytes* with piercing penetration has nothing to do with the concept of pure pitch, but describes metaphorically the impact of sounds, conceived as bodies, when they attack the ear: *oxys* is also used in Homer to describe a pointed lance or arrow" (Rocconi 2003b, 390). More generally on the cultural constructions of phonosphere in antiquity see Bettini 2008 and Crippa 2015. An analytical survey of ancient Greek terms for sounds is in Kaimio 1977.

2 The term phonosphere, or soundscape, refers to all those elements in the acoustic environment that can be perceived by human beings. Even if the soundscape consists in natural and physical elements similar in essence everywhere, it can nevertheless be culturally processed in very different ways according to different cultures.

3 On the important distinctions concerning Aristotelian terminology about animal voices (*ψόφος*, *φωνή*, and *διάλεκτος*) see above all Ax 1978. Cf. Belardi 1975, 126-8.

4 Among the contemporary studies in ethology, cognitive psychology and zoology that lead to questioning the uniqueness of human beings in terms of 'culture', 'language', 'communication skills', see Lestel 2001; on experiments conducted with non-human primates in order to teach them American sign language, see Lestel 1995. Cf. Cimatti *et al.* 2016.

5 Arist. *HA* 535a-536b; cf. id. *GA* 786b 17 ff.; id. *Pol.* 1253a. When Aristotle speaks about the animal *dialektos*, i.e. the physiological section of his *Historia animalium* (book 4, ch. 9), he simply identifies *dialektos* as a particular way of producing some specific sounds (*ἄφωνα*, i.e.,

In antiquity non-human animals (at least mammals, but not fish or insects) were considered capable only of producing *phone*, defined by Aristotle as the capacity of producing any sort of sounds by means of the lungs and the pharynx. Despite their lack of *logos* and linguistic capacity, the sounds (φωναί) produced by non-human animals were, in a way, meaningful (σημαντικοὶ ψόφοι) because they could be interpreted by human observers as indicators of the feelings or the attitudes of the animals themselves (pain, happiness, docility and so on). Animal sounds have a natural origin and are difficult to interpret since they lack those conventional and one-to-one links between a term and its meaning, which Aristotle would define as *symbola*.⁶ The communication between animals and human beings has a purely symbolic and unidimensional character since it does not rely on linguistic correspondences, contrary to the highly sophisticated and multidimensional verbal communication among human beings, which is based on the conventional relationship between sounds and meanings. Because voice, as opposed to language, is considered a natural entity, it could also represent a sort of natural indicator of proximity between human beings and non-human animals. The more an animal is able to imitate human sounds or phonic chains, the more it may be conceived as 'human-like'. Indeed if fish and insects were normally considered animals without voice (ἄφωνα ζῷα),⁷ on the contrary (some) birds, despite being distant from the human *Gestalt*, could nevertheless be included among the 'human-like' animals, *anthropoeide*, just by virtue of their vocal qualities. Such is the case of some nocturnal birds of prey, like the little owl (γλαῦξ) or the scops owl (ῥίτος, σκῶψ), which are defined as imitators of human gestures and sounds; in a similar way, the small parrot (ψιττακός) is called by Aristotle an *anthropoglotton*, a 'human-tongue' bird.⁸

With regard to this, what about monkeys? Praised in many cases as imitators of human bodily movements, non-human primates lose their excellence when

consonants and more complex sounds) by using lips and tongue. See Labarrière 2004, 19-59 and Manetti 1993, 74-5. On the animal voice, see Lachenaud 2013, 92-9.

6 Arist. *Int.* 16a; id. *Po.* 1456b; id. *Pol.* 1253a. Cf. Manetti 1993, 71-7. For animal cries imitated by humans in the course of religious ceremonies as a sort of 'natural way of communication' with the gods, see Crippa 2012. Cf. Perrot 2012.

7 E.g. Arist. *de An.* 421a; id. *HA* 535b. On the term *phthongos* as pure sonority, see the critical evaluation in Crippa 2015, 163-72.

8 See Arist. *HA* 597b 21-5; Ath. 9.391b; Ael. *NA* 15.28. See in particular Arist. *HA* 597b 26-8, where Aristotle refers to the mimetical capacity of birds of prey and speaks of the parrot as well; cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.6 (*imitatrix ales ... vocum simulantior ales*). On the ancient cultural representation of birds of preys, see above all Normand 2015, esp. 486-90. Concerning voice imitation in ancient Greek myth Cf. Brillante 2008.

it comes to the universe of sounds. Monkeys (πίθηκοι for the ancient Greeks) have always been associated with human actions and with their imitation. Especially from the Hellenistic period onwards, the lexical root **mim-* has in fact very often been used to describe non-human primates, defined as *mimeloi*, or *mimemata*, copies of humans.⁹ Although this mimetic attitude of monkeys is disparaged and considered superficial and of poor quality by human observers, monkeys are still described as notoriously capable of dancing, perfectly reproducing human gestures and movements, or as skilful in playing table games,¹⁰ being observers of the humans who routinely played. It would then be reasonable to expect a similar admirable competence also in the domain of sounds: such expectations, however, are soon disappointed. Indeed the most important ancient catalogues of animal voices or calls, from Aristotle to the few fragments by Suetonius, do not pay any attention to the auditory features of monkeys' voices.¹¹ Why does this happen? Are there any specific cultural grounds for such an exclusion of monkeys from the Muses' domain? A survey of the ancient evidence on this subject may provide some clues. In discussing this, special attention will be given to the main *native* categories¹² used by the Greeks in the contexts in which the voice of monkeys has been specifically discussed.¹³ On the basis of this survey, then, I will conclude my study with a

9 On the mimetic attitude of monkeys see, above all, Ael. *NA* 5.26, 7.21; Str. 15.1.29; [Opp.] *C.* 2.605 ff.

10 Plin. *HN* 8.215.

11 There is no mention of non-human primates' voices, for instance, in Suet. *Liber de naturis rerum* 247-54 Reifferscheid. On this see Bettini 2008, 265f. (where a larger bibliography is quoted); Wackernagel 1867, 27 (Affe: *stridor*). Other animal species, instead, in particular birds, are credited with a special 'natural' aptitude for music and rhythm both in antiquity and in modern zoomusicological studies (cf. Mâche 1991, esp. 108-74). See also Arbo-Arbo 2006.

12 According to an anthropological perspective, the term 'native' refers to the specific beliefs and the cultural representations that a given society use when defining and thinking about specific phenomena like, e.g., their phonosphere (cf. Bettini 2014).

13 My purpose is here threefold: a) to concentrate on a shared 'folk' origin of meanings deeply embedded in the ancient cultural encyclopaedia; b) to retrace possible symbolic associations and cultural interpretations on the basis of which something 'slight' was possibly thought in everyday language as 'small' too, independently of any theoretical distinction; c) to take into account the 'axiological' dimension of terms used to categorize sounds: indeed sounds, melodies and voices can be appreciated as 'harmonious', 'decent', 'virile' or depreciated as 'shameful', 'bad' or 'embarrassing'. On such methodologically fundamental aspects see Barker 2002; on the semiotic dimension of value judgments for the linguistic signs, see Hjelmslev 1954.

new and culturally oriented interpretation of the ancient iconography showing Orpheus and the monkey.

2 How Does It Sound? The Voice of Monkeys or an Exploration of Auditory Features

A very important piece of information on the voice of monkeys is to be found in the huge *corpus* of Galen, probably the ancient author who, more than any others, mentions non-human primates giving not only many details concerning their anatomical features, but also, more generally, furnishing hints about the cultural attitudes of his contemporaries towards these animals. In particular, a passage from book 8 of the *Anatomical Procedures* (Gal. AA 8.1 Garofalo) focuses on the structure of the thorax, paying specific attention to the two muscular ligaments that connect the *phrenes*, the diaphragm, to the lower part of the spinal column. Galen notes that these connections (συνδεσμοί) are very strong and thick in animals with a 'big voice' (μεγαλόφωνα), but that the opposite is the case in animals characterised by a 'small voice' (μικρόφωνα) and whose muscles in the thorax are weak, as they are in monkeys (οἶός περ καὶ ὁ πίθηκος). Here is a small piece of the puzzle: monkeys are 'weak-voiced' animals since they have a muscular structure that is weak or even sickly.¹⁴ The series of oppositions built here by Galen establishes a contrast between the presence of a strong voice and muscles in the chest of a living being, on the one hand, and an anatomical lack of vigour that normally entails a weak and feeble voice, on the other hand. But this is not the only association of *pithekoî* with *mikrophonia* in Galen.

Indeed, a second passage from book 7 of his treatise *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body* (7.11 Helmreich) is specifically devoted to the explanation of how the phonatory system is structured and how it functions. Having reminded his pupils of his book *On Voice* (Περὶ φωνῆς), now lost, where he had explained the importance of the larynx for the process of voice production, Galen begins to describe the three main cartilages which form the voice box of

14 The feeble and flabby anatomical structure of monkeys is confirmed by a large part of zoological tradition, like the *Cynegetica* treatise where the epic adjective ἀβληχρός 'soft, without vigour' is used to describe the body of monkeys (see [Opp.] C. 2.605 ff.). It is important also to emphasise that monkeys are defined by Galen (AA 8.8) as 'hideous spectacle' (εἰδεχθὲς θέαμα), a term used only once more in the entire *corpus Galenicum* to define the repulsive aspect of a man suffering from elephantiasis (Gal. *De simpl. med. temper. ac facult.* 12.312 Kühn).

any living being. Monkeys appear as key characters also here, since they lack something even in this part of the sound-producing process: they are deprived of two of the twelve muscles which allow the larynx to be set in motion, specifically the two small muscles at the base of the arytenoids, a pair of cartilages forming the larynx. Animals lacking this anatomical feature are described by Galen as *mikrophona*, 'weak-voiced', and the only prototypical example of such a zoological class¹⁵ that he cites is the monkey (ὦν ἐστι καὶ ὁ πίθηκος). Even though in public anatomical demonstrations Galen often dissected monkeys, in particular Barbary Apes (= anc. Greek πίθηκοι), in order to show the similarity of some features of their morphotype with human beings, this does not happen when he discusses their voice and the sounds they produce. This is confirmed by Galen's account of one of his public performances (ἐπιδείξεις) in the work *De praecognitione*. Invited by the philosopher and politician Flavius Boethus to give a lesson in Rome on the mechanism of voice production (ὅπως ἀναπνοή τε καὶ φωνὴ γίνεται), Galen recalls how he prevented the organisers from purchasing monkeys:¹⁶

[...] ὁπότ' οὖν παρεκάλεσέ με διδάξαι διὰ τῶν ἀνατομῶν ὅπως ἀναπνοή τε καὶ φωνὴ γίνεται, παρεσκευάσεν ἐρίφους τε καὶ χοίρους πλείονας· πιθήκων γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔφην δεῖσθαι τὴν ἀνατομὴν, ὁμοίως τε τὴν κατασκευὴν ἐχόντων οὐ μόνον τούτων τῶν ζώων, ἀλλὰ καὶ πεζῶν σχεδὸν ἀπάντων· ὅσα δὲ φωνὴν ἔχει μεγάλην, ἐπιτηδειότερα τῶν μικροφώνων εἶναι, παρασχεῖν ἀποδεικτικὰ λήμματα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ προκειμένου πίστιν.

[...] When he invited me to show him by dissections how breath and speech are produced he got several kids and pigs ready. I had said that there was no need to dissect monkeys¹⁷ since not only these but almost all other land animals are similar in structure: those with loud voices are much better at providing a convincing demonstration to prove the point at issue than those with soft.

TRANS. V. NUTTON

15 This kind of 'folk' taxon in ancient zoology has not a pervasive and systematic diffusion, although it represents an important label to think about animal zoosphere for ancient Greeks. Cf. Zucker 2005, 246f.

16 Gal. *Progn.* 5.8 Nutton.

17 I have modified Nutton's translation of the word *pithekos* replacing the term 'ape' with the term 'monkey' for the sake of consistency, having translated *pithekos* as 'monkey' throughout the paper. Animals called 'apes' in modern times (like chimpanzees, bonobos, orangutans, gorillas) were probably unknown to ancient Greeks (see Garofalo 1991).

On this occasion monkeys are unfit for his public show—Galen explains—because their vocal apparatus seems to be exactly the same as that of the other mammals (e.g. ἔριφοι, ‘kids’) and because it is able to produce¹⁸ only sounds of low intensity.¹⁹

Galen does not explain what he means by having a ‘weak’ or a ‘small’ voice, probably because such an expression was clear to his audience and, in his opinion, it did not deserve further discussion. To better understand, however, what ancient Greeks might have meant by these terms, it will be useful to turn to Aristotle and to his treatises on animals. Although a couple of passages in the *Historia animalium* make a distinction between silent animals and those emitting sounds (φωνήεντα), discussing topics which may be relevant to the present discussion, there is no mention here of the term *mikrophonia*. Instead we can find important information in Aristotle’s *De generatione animalium* (Arist. *GA* 687b):²⁰

ἐπεὶ δὲ βαρὺ μὲν ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ βραδείαν εἶναι τὴν κίνησιν, ὅξυ δ’ ἐν τῷ ταχείαν, τοῦ δὴ βραδέως ἢ ταχέως πότερον τὸ κινεῖν αἴτιον ἢ τὸ κινούμενον, ἔχει τινὰ ἀπορίαν. φασὶ γάρ τινες τὸ μὲν πολὺ βραδέως κινεῖσθαι τὸ δ’ ὀλίγον ταχέως, καὶ ταύτην αἰτίαν εἶναι τοῦ τὰ μὲν βαρύνφωνα εἶναι τὰ δ’ ὀξύφωνα, λέγοντες μέχρι τινὸς καλῶς, ὅλως δ’ οὐ καλῶς.

But since deepness of pitch consists in the movement being slow, and height of pitch in its being fast, the question is whether the speed is caused by that which initiates or that which experiences the movement, and this somewhat puzzling. Some people hold that the movement of a large volume is slow and that of a small volume is fast, and that this is the cause why some animals have deep voices and others high ones.

TRANS. A.L. PECK

18 Cf. Gal. *AA* 11.5.110f. Duckworth. This passage from Book 11 of *Anatomicae administrationes*, only surviving in an Arabic translation, stresses as well the stronger voice of a piglet compared to that of a monkey.

19 The polarity, which plays a major role in the ancient Greek phonosphere, between ‘small’ (μικρά) and ‘big’ (μεγάλη) voice refers to what we normally define as acoustic pressure distinguishing powerful sounds from weak ones. On the metaphorical origins of sound vocabulary in ancient Greece, see Rocconi 2003a, esp. 57f.

20 Arist. *GA* 786b–788b. Other Aristotelian passages dealing with auditory categories are to be found in Arist. *de An.* 420a 29 ff.; id. *Sens.* 446a 24, 446b5–30; id. *HA* 535a 27–536b 23. On book 5 of Aristotle’s *De generatione animalium* see Liutsi 2000, esp. 179–94 of chapter 7.

Here Aristotle makes a clear distinction between two pairs of opposites which cannot be confused or superimposed:²¹ the terms *baryphonia/oxyphonia* (i.e. 'deep voice'/'high-pitched voice'), which have to do with 'pitch', and a second acoustic opposition, i.e. *megalophonia/mikrophonia* (i.e. 'big voice'/'small voice'), which has to do with the 'volume' of sounds. Throughout the whole chapter, Aristotle argues against the quite common opinion which in antiquity connected 'small' and 'high' voices. Aristotle repeatedly attacks this widely shared assumption delegitimizing the opinions of his opponents (φᾶσι γὰρ τινες ... λέγοντες μέχρι τινὸς καλῶς ... τοῦτο δὲ ψεῦδος) and contrasting them with the logic of his reasoning on the nature of the voice. Underlying the opinion mixing up different pairs of opposites, there was the widespread belief that something heavy is normally slower because of the large quantity of material which has to be set in motion: the adjective *baryphonos*, describing a person who has a deep and heavy voice because of the large amount of air passing through his/her voice box, suggests that also the resultant voice is 'big' in volume. In a similar vein, a person who is *oxyphonos* would also be *mikrophonos* because of the small quantity of air set in motion.²² Aristotle disagreed with these opinions, and he kept the two pairs of opposites separated by introducing the important distinction between *to kinoun* (lit. 'what moves', 'the cause of movement') and *to kinoumenon* ('what is moved'). *Baryphōnia* and *oxyphonia* not only consist of a certain quantity of mass (air) set in motion but, as Aristotle underlines, a significant role in their production is also played by the driving force of the 'motor' that moves it (the vocal apparatus or the muscular strength).²³

More relevant to the present discussion is the false opinion, regarded as nonsense (ψεῦδος) by Aristotle, which associates or even equates a 'small' with a 'high-pitched' voice. The opinion that considered small voices also high-

21 It is worth remembering that such an identification of categories, where the notion of 'bigness' determines the pitch of a sound produced, is to be found in many sections of Book 11 in the Peripatetic *Problemata*, in particular [Arist.] *Pr.* 11.3, 6, 15, 16.

22 An opposite view conceiving 'loud' sounds as 'high' too was very probably expressed by Archytas of Tarentum (47 B 1.24-41 DK: μέγᾱλα τε ἦμεν καὶ ὀξεῖα). For the Aristotelian rectification of such a thesis, see Arist. *de An.* 419b 4-420b 4. Contrasting ways of describing sounds often originated from non-technical uses of adjectives in other domains of the language (tragedy, epic poetry, and so on) and reality (war, public performance, and so on), as Barker (2002) explains.

23 On this see also Philopon. *In Arist. de gen. anim.* E 7 (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 14, 240f.). Cf. Liatsi 2000, 185: "die jungen und die weiblichen Lebewesen haben zwar in den meisten Fällen eine hohe Stimme, weil sie aufgrund ihrer Schwäche nur wenig Luft bewegen können".

pitched and feeble is reported by the Peripatetic *Problemata*, a work transmitted under the name of Aristotle himself.²⁴ In chapter 37 of book 19, devoted to musical matters, the author asks the reason why it is usually harder work to sing high pitches than low ones, even though high-pitched sounds imply a smaller quantity of air set in motion (hence they should imply a lesser task). The author of the treatise starts his reasoning by saying that, since high pitch in sound goes with smallness (κατὰ τὸ ὀλίγον), it should normally be moved with less effort than a large mass of air, being “a lesser task to move what is small than what is large, and hence this is true of air too”.²⁵ Therefore in articulating his counter-intuitive answer to his former question, the author makes a finer distinction between naturally high-pitched voices, on the one hand, and high-pitched notes produced by singing, on the other hand. He states that a naturally high-pitched voice, produced by a small quantity of air, is weak by nature (φύσει μὲν ὀξύφωνα ἅπαντα δι’ ἀσθένειαν) since it cannot move a large quantity of air (μὴ δύνασθαι) but only a little; on the contrary someone being able to produce a high note whenever he wants is a proficient singer who deserves admiration because of his ability to impart strength to the air and to produce high-pitched sounds (ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄδειν τὸ ὀξύ δυνάμεως σημεῖον).

3 Anthropology of Voices: Feeble Sounds, Monkeys, and Ancient Imagery

We are now in a better position to understand the opinions of the ancient Greek writers concerning the voice of non-human primates. They thought that a small and tiny anatomical structure could emit only a small quantity of air: therefore animals provided with such a vocal apparatus had also a feeble, small voice (μικροφωνία).

24 On the two books dedicated to acoustics and music in the *Problemata* (11 and 19), see the detailed analysis in Petrucci 2011. Here the old idea of a chaotic work made up of later interpolations and additions inconsistent with each other is replaced by the bright consideration of the dialectical nature of the *Problemata*, where a plurality of discussions and debates from Aristotle to the following scholars would be mirrored. Cf. also Forster 1928.

25 See in particular the first two lines of [Arist.] *Pr.* 19.37: Διὰ τί τοῦ ἐν φωνῇ ὀξέος ὄντος κατὰ τὸ ὀλίγον, τοῦ δὲ βαρέος κατὰ τὸ πολὺ (τὸ μὲν γὰρ βαρὺ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος βαρὺ, τὸ δὲ ὀξὺ δι’ ὀλιγότητα ταχύ) ἔργον μᾶλλον ἄδειν τὰ ὀξέα ἢ τὰ βαρέα ... (“Why is it, given that high pitch in sound goes with smallness and low pitch with large quantity (since what is low-pitched is slow because of the quantity, while what is high-pitched is swift because of the smallness), that it is harder work to sing high pitches than low ones ...”, trans. A. Barker). On Book 11 of the *Problemata*, see Barker 1984, 190-204.

However, especially in oral tradition societies, talking about the voice and its paralinguistic traits implies also reconstructing the complex and symbolic meanings behind the ‘natural’ elements (e.g. voice print, timbre or pitch), meanings that are specifically connected with some culturally-oriented judgments or beliefs that are specific to that society.²⁶ In order to illustrate how voices can be linguistically processed and integrated in much larger symbolic constructions, I will now consider the example of the Dogon tribes in Mali.²⁷

The Dogon culture considers the ‘nasal voice’ an important category, not only to distinguish a person within his/her specific local group, but also to describe other communities or groups of people. Even more interesting, however, is their description of ‘nasal’ voices as ‘rotten’ voices. As G. Calame-Griaule (1993, 25f.) argues, such apparently odd wording seems to suggest that they imagine that the natural path of the voice is interrupted: a nasal vocalization implies that the vocal apparatus does not emit the sounds smoothly, but the voice remains stuck in the throat, triggering a process of air putrefaction. For this reason, nasal voices are very often associated with sterility and inarticulateness, being sometimes linked with the Dogon principle of female infertility.²⁸ Hence people characterized by a nasal voice (regarded as rotten and putrid) are considered a bad omen, closer to the world of the dead.

This comparative example illustrates not only the different evaluation of a specific sound quality in the various cultures but, more extensively, also the peculiar role each of them might have attributed to vocal communication in social life, insofar as the voice is always connected with an intricate network of other categories (such as moral values, gender and so on). Therefore a discussion of the anthropology of the ancient animal phonosphere may be improved by devoting specific attention to the connections established by Greek and Roman sources between the vocal qualities of monkeys and those of other figures in ancient society. We should therefore start by asking who were

26 On the notion of paralanguage in communication theory, pioneering work is to be found in Trager 1958. For the case study of dog voice in ancient Greece cf. Franco 2007. A detailed introduction to the studies in anthropology of voices may be found in Crippa 2015, 11–20.

27 For a detailed analysis of the Dogon culture, especially with regard to the human phonosphere, see Calame-Griaule 1965.

28 “Dans la classification que les Dogons établissent entre les différentes formes de parole et les principes spirituels de la personne (qui sont au nombre de huit, par paires de sexe opposé, positive et négatives) cette «voix pourrie» est associée au principe «bête femelle de sexe» en rapport avec les menstrues et la stérilité” (Calame-Griaule 1993, 26). On the links between Dogon phonosphere and their myths, see Dieterlen 1989.

the figures described as *mikrophonoi* in antiquity, and how they were culturally perceived.

Ancient texts discuss the quality of *mikrophonia* especially when illustrating artistic performances, as may be expected. The most reknown example is in the ancient biography of Sophocles where,²⁹ while discussing the many innovations introduced by the playwright in the practice of acting, we are given important information about the quality of his voice. Besides increasing the number of the chorus' dancers in tragedy, Sophocles put an end to the tradition according to which the author himself usually acted in performances of his dramas. The reasons given for this change is Sophocles' inability to be heard in open-air theatrical spaces due to his *mikrophonia*, i.e. his 'small voice'.

And so, far from being regarded as a sign of refinement or delicacy, a 'small' voice could directly cause the failure of an artistic public performance, as a malicious remark by Suetonius in his *Life of Nero* confirms.³⁰ We are told that the emperor had tried, with a great deal of physical effort, to improve his voice and to become a proficient actor,³¹ very often supported by his flattering servants, to the extent that he went on stage despite his *exigua vox*, a patently 'weak' and 'small' voice which should have prevented every reasonable person from singing and performing music. We are led to think that, in critical accounts of professional singers or public heralds, *mikrophonia* was part of the larger gamut of categories that described their serious vocal failings. Galen's criticism of Chrysippus' use of the term *alogon* explains how *aphonon*, similarly introduced by the prefix *a-*, not only was used to describe a living being which had no voice at all (like a fish), but it could also designate someone suffering from a serious problem in voice production, possibly involving a 'small' or a 'dark', 'unclear' voice.³²

29 *Vita Sophoclis* 20ff. (TrGF vol. 4 Radt). See also De Martino 1995.

30 Suet. *Nero* 20. On the importance of vocal qualities for professional singers, see West 1992, 39-47.

31 A preliminary but detailed study the social and cultural practice of *phōnaskia* may be found in Barker 2010.

32 Gal. *Plac. Hipp. Plat.* 4.4.11 De Lacy (*CMG* 5, 4.1.2): εἰ δέ τις ἄφωνον εἶναι λέγοι τὸν κιθαρῳδὸν ἢ τὸν κήρυκα, κάκωσιν τινα ἐνδείκνυται τῆς φωνῆς τάνθρώπου· ἢ γὰρ μικρόφωνον ἢ τραχύφωνον ἢ μελάμφωνον ἢ τι τοιοῦτον ἔτερον εἶναι φησιν αὐτόν, οὐ μὴν παντελῶς γ' ἐστερηθῆναι φωνῆς ("But if he says that a singer to the *kithara* or a herald is voiceless, he is indicating some impairment of the person's voice; he is saying that the person is weak-voiced or harsh-voiced or has an indistinct voice or something else of that kind, but not that he is completely without a voice", trans. Ph.H. De Lacy). For a similar use of *aphonon* to designate a bad singer, cf. Dion. Thr. p. 12 Uhlig: ἄφωνον λέγομεν τὸν τραγῳδὸν τὸν κακόφωνον. Even though volume

As dangerous and crippling for public performance as it may have been, however, *mikrophonia* was considered a much more serious problem when it was structurally inherent in a living being, permanently characterising its nature and influencing its social interactions. Indeed ‘small’ voices were conceived as important and distinctive features on which judgements and evaluations could be based. But what kind of judgment did ancient Greek society give on such a qualification of the voice? A possible answer may be suggested by the previously quoted passage of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata*, where the author discusses the question of the eunuchs’ identity.³³ By asking how much eunuchs really resemble women, some traits of the feminine model are examined, including the main auditory features which characterize a woman’s voice. Among the feminine characteristics into which eunuchs are considered to degenerate (εἰς τὸ θήλυ διαφθειρόμενοι), the female voice (θήλυκῇ φωνῇ) stands out, easily recognisable as high-pitched and piercing, *oxeia*.³⁴ The cultural and social construction of gender was particularly widespread in ancient or traditional societies, affecting also medical and biological theories and influencing value judgments concerning ‘superiority’, ‘nobility’ or ‘decorum’ and ‘restraint’ of specific genders. Also Aristotle referred to the alleged nobility and excellence of the male *baryphonia*: καὶ δοκεῖ γεννασιτέρας εἶναι φύσεως ἢ βαρυφωνία.³⁵ These kinds of stereotypical gender-based evaluations are confirmed by an intriguing passage by the physician Aretaeus.³⁶ All the

and voice clarity represent two different aspects pertaining to phonosphere, Galen seems to consider them very similar in denoting a lack of vocal proficiency.

- 33 [Arist.] *Pr.* 10.36. For the distinction between auditory features considered normal (and normative too) and those thought of as deviant from a masculine norm, see Crippa 2015, 21–70.
- 34 This kind of acute voice producing high-pitched sounds was culturally perceived as ‘feminine’ and also expressed by the word *ligys* and *ligyros* to denote, among other sounds, a kind of shrill cry. On this auditory feature as a gender trait in the cultural construction of the herald (κήρυξ), see Goblot-Cahen 2007, 269–74. On the gendered representation of cries in antiquity, see Sébillotte-Cuchet 2003. On the meaning of *ligys* in the ancient phonosphere, see Rocconi 2003a (esp. 84, 93, where the stress is on the charming and persuasive nature of this sound) and Rocconi 2016. On gender and voice in antiquity, see Carson 1994.
- 35 Arist. *GA* 786b 35. Cf. Petrucci 2011, 184–94.
- 36 Aret. *SD* 2.5.3 Hude (*CMG* 2): καὶ ἡμέας ἄνδρας ποιεῖ ζωοῦσα ἡ θορή, θερμούς, ἐνάρθρους, λασίους, εὐφώνους, εὐθύμους, κραταιοὺς νοῆσαι τε καὶ ῥέξαι· δηλοῦσι οἱ ἄνδρες. οἷσι δὲ οὐκ ἔνεστι ζωοῦσα ἡ θορή, ῥικνοί, ἀσθενέες, ὀξύφωνοι, ἄτριχες, ἀγένειοι, γυναικώδεις· δηλοῦσι οἱ εὐνοῦχοι (“For it is the semen, when possessed of vitality, which makes us to be men, hot, well braced in limbs, hairy, well voiced, spirited, strong to think and to act, as the characteristics of men prove. For when the semen is not possessed of its vitality, persons become shrivelled, have a sharp tone of voice, lose their hair and their beard, and become effemi-

best qualities of a male body are due, according to Aretaeus, to the very nature of his seminal liquid (θορή), which alone shapes the superiority of the *andres* giving them advantages like a warm body, a fully developed anatomical structure, higher intelligence, and, most importantly for our enquiry, a harmonious voice (εὐφώνους). On the contrary, in accordance with such a binary logic, the absence of sperm deprives any man of his superiority affecting also his voice, which degenerates into a 'high-pitched' and feminine tone (ὀξύφωνοι) lacking strength and intensity, as in the case of the eunuchs.

To sum up and conclude this brief enquiry into the world of the ancient phonsphere, I would like to mention a medical treatise which may give some very helpful insights. Oribasius, physician of the Emperor Julian, in his *Collectiones* uses the term *mikrophonoi* to describe all the people unable to produce a strong and enduring sound when speaking (τοῖς ἥχοις ἀσθενεῖς) because of the narrowness of their airways (πυκνοὶ καὶ στενόποροι).³⁷ Probably relying on what the surgeon Antyllus had already said two centuries earlier,³⁸ Oribasius provides his readers with a specific list of socio-biological profiles that underpin his medical discourse: 'weak-voiced' or 'small-voiced' are children, women and eunuchs, who all share the same fragility (and inferiority) in relation to men (τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀσθενέστεροι περὶ φωνήν).

This kind of dichotomy, separating strong and vigorous men from weak and delicate figures like women or eunuchs, plays a central role also in the cultural construction of the natural animal world. Indeed, solely on the basis of their auditory features, monkeys are perceived as sickly creatures characterized by want of strength, especially concerning the voice's production. This is so true that their voices sound very much like those of dead people, at least according to Ovid, who describes the animal cry of Cercopes, which have been transformed into monkeys, as a *stridor*.³⁹ Such a sonorous qualification shares an etymological origin with the Greek word *trizein*, combining the low intensity (i.e. a 'small' volume) with the piercing characteristics of sounds like the cry of a bat or the voice of the weary and feeble dead.⁴⁰

nate, as the characteristics of eunuchs prove", trans. F. Adams). A fundamental discussion of gender identity concerning voices in antiquity is in Crippa 2015, 39-50.

37 Orib. *Coll. Med.* 6.10.10 Raeder (*CMG* 6, 1.1).

38 On Antyllus and his lost work, see especially Grant 1960.

39 Ov. *Met.* 14.98-100: *misit in has sedes nec non prius abstulit usum / verborum et natae dira in periuria linguae; / posse queri tantum rauco stridore reliquit*. On *stridor* as the vocal print of the dead see in particular Bettini 1986, 228-35. On the *stridor* of Alcestis in Accius fr. 633 D. (= 57 R.), see Aricò 2008; Stramaglia 1995.

40 This kind of natural voice, characterized as weak and small, seems to act as a distinguishing device in order to separate the dead from the living, non-men from real men, bad

4 Conclusion: A Voice without the Muse, or the Dark Side of Lightness

This analysis has led us to shed a new light on the ancient animal phonosphere, in particular on the link between non-human primates and the culturally relevant category of *mikrophonia*. As I have argued on the basis of ancient sources, monkeys were perceived as ‘weak-voiced’ creatures lacking vigour and strength in their anatomical structure, being *mikrophona* because of the small quantity of air passing through their voice boxes and because of their fragile (and small) body shape. This is confirmed by the possible identification, advocated by some ancient writers, of a ‘weak and small’ voice with a ‘high-pitched voice’ (that is, by the widely assumed connection between μικροφωνία and ὀξυφωνία). Both these vocal qualities were associated with the universe of women or young boys or even eunuchs, all sharing the same auditory features in opposition to the virile and heroic voices of free adult men made up of deep sounds (ὀξυφωνία as opposed to βαρυφωνία, see [Arist.] *Pr.* 11.6). In a certain way, the voice-print (timbre, width, intensity etc.) identifying a feminine voice was associated with monkeys too (as well as with other anti-virile figures), since they were both connected to the notion of ‘minus’ and ‘delicacy’.

Keeping in mind this cultural peculiarity which places monkeys in the world of delicate and ‘not virile’ voices, we could reconsider the interpretation of some iconographical depictions of Orpheus, another ‘feminine’ figure, while enchanting animals. Among the animals surrounding Orpheus, a few rare mosaics and some reliefs (lamps, dishes and so on) also include a monkey very often gazing at Orpheus himself, in contrast to the vast majority of the other animals showing no direct visual contact with the singer.⁴¹ Different, and often totally contrasting, interpretations have been proposed for similar

performers from good performers, and in turn monkeys from humans. On the *exigua vox* of the emperor seen as a bad performer cf. Suet. *Nero* 20; on the *exigua vox* of the dead see Verg. *Aen.* 6.492. See also Lyc. *Alex.* 686, where the voice attributed to the shadows of the dead is described as ‘thin’ and ‘weak’, *lepte*. For the verb *trizein*, see Dieu 2015.

41 On the contrary, some reliefs represent Orpheus looking at animals other than monkeys, very often birds (probably songbirds or avian imitators of human voice like ψιττακοί or γλαυκες). Although it would be worth investigating more extensively the ancient lore concerning these animals, it is beyond the scope of this research.

scenes.⁴² Some scholars⁴³ have interpreted them as a sort of religious parody directed against Orpheus, while others⁴⁴ have argued that the mimetic ability possessed by monkeys in playing and singing could have called into question the supremacy of humans in the field of arts. Both these hypotheses are certainly possible, but they do not rely on any 'native' ancient cultural categories: in other words, they do not take into account what ancient culture really expressed both in its medical and zoological traditions and in literary and folk narratives about monkeys.

For this reason, as a conclusion, I propose a new possible interpretation of these iconographical models. When Orpheus and a Greek *pithekos* face each other, they could symbolically represent alternative ways of producing the same vocal quality of *oxytes*, as in the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problema* quoted above, whose author asks whether it is one and the same thing to be naturally high-voiced (ὀξύφωνον ... φύσει) because of a natural weakness and to sing high (τὸ ὀξύ ψᾶειν).⁴⁵ The answer to such an intriguing question may suggest which kind of link with the category of 'acute' voice Orpheus and the monkey could have had. According to the author, the capacity to sing high-pitched notes is a sign of power and superiority (δυνάμεως σημείον), since such a skilful singer is capable of vehemently pushing a large quantity of air in a small span of time by using all his strength and muscular vigour through his vocal apparatus.⁴⁶

42 For a general survey of iconographic sources representing Orpheus charming the animals, see Garezu 1994. Among the mosaics and reliefs depicting a monkey looking at Orpheus who plays music, see nn. 147, 157b; *ibid.* 94-5. Very often, especially on stone or terracotta reliefs, monkeys seem to be looking at Orpheus, who sometimes is depicted as looking back at them, as in *ibid.* 94 n. 143; cf. *ibid.* 96 nn. 151, 158, 159. In the famous mosaic from Sousse, the animal playing a *pandoura* and adopting the central Orpheus' posture is more likely to be interpreted as a bear rather than as a monkey. For a description of the mosaic (now at the Louvre Museum) see *ibid.* 98 n. 192 (Louvre inv. MNC 1145; cat. Ma 1798); cf. Bajoni 2002, *passim*.

43 See, for instance, Cèbe (1966, 364) speaking about "un artiste païen parodiant sa propre religion". On monkeys as living parodies of humans, cf. McDermott 1938, 289-90. On the Egyptian cultural peculiarity of monkeys represented as playing music see, among others, Vendries 2002, 189-92.

44 See Bajoni (2002, 87) who argues, on the basis of Porph. *Abst.* 3.15, that monkeys could be seen in late antiquity as animals questioning the uniqueness of the human status, in particular while performing as proficiently as only humans were thought to do.

45 [Arist.] *Pr.* 19.37. Cf. *ibid.* 11.14: Διὰ τί οἱ παῖδες καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῶν ζώων τὰ νέα ὀξύτερον φθέγγονται τῶν τελείων, καὶ ταῦτα τῆς ὀξύτητος σφοδρότητος οὐσης.

46 On the acute voice of Orpheus as professional singer, see in particular a fragment by Phanocles (fr. 1.16-18 Powell): ἡχὴ δ' ὥς λιγυρῆς πόντον ἐπέσχε λύρης, / νήσους τ' αἰγιαλοὺς θ' ἀλιμυρέας, ἔνθα λίγειαν / ἄνδρες Ὀρφεῖν ἐκτέρισαν κεφαλὴν. Cf. John of Gaza 1.33-

Thanks to his proficiency, which can be obtained only after a long time of discipline and training, he may cultivate a refined voice capable of producing harmonious, high-pitched and delicate sounds.⁴⁷ On the contrary, someone naturally endowed with an 'acute', 'feeble', and 'feminine' voice can only push a small quantity of air because of his structural weakness (δι' ἀσθενείαν), being in a certain way affected by a serious flaw in its nature. Creatures with such an acute voice are, as Book 11 of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* seems to confirm, characterized by a one-dimensional slight voice (τὰ ἅλλα λεπτὰ ἐν διάστημα ἔχει), which is at the opposite end of the vocal spectrum from that of the voice of adult men (ὧν οὐδέτερον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι).⁴⁸

I then advance the hypothesis that the monkeys depicted next to Orpheus were meant to represent the domain of 'lightness' and 'delicacy' by virtue of their cultural affinity with the vocal qualities of women and eunuchs: *mikrotes*, 'smallness', and *leptotes*, 'thinness', seem to have been culturally aligned within the same category of *to oligon*, representing two different, though connected, treatments of it. Therefore on the one hand Orpheus could symbolically represent the notions of art and craft, the artificial dimension of powerful knowledge which allows what is small and thin to become refined and artistically polished. On the other hand monkeys could embody the 'dark side' of lightness, what is small and weak by nature, since their voices cannot be redeemed by any refinement or skilful virtuosity. Monkeys remain in their state of nature: they are naturally incapable animals provided with powerless voices (μικρόφωνα ζῶα), prevented forever from becoming *oxyphona* and *leptophona*, high-pitched and melodious animals.

35: ὁ δὲ καλλίμολος Ὀρφεύς / σὺν ἐμοὶ μέλος λιγαῖνοι. See also the proemium of the Orphic Argonauts, Orph. A. 1-6: πέμπε δ' ἐπὶ πραπίδεσσιν ἐμαῖς ἐτυμηγόρον αὐδὴν / ὄφρα πολυσπερέεσσι βρότοις λιγύφωνον ἀοιδὴν.

47 A voice like that of singers was considered, especially by orators, too delicate and refined (*mollis*) to be used during a public forensic performance. On this aspect, see in particular Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.23-26: *non enim tam molli teneraque voce quam forti ac durabili opus est, cum illi omnes etiam altissimos sonos leniant cantu oris ... Quare vocem deliciis non molliamus*. On the womanish characterization of the tragic poet Agathon in the prologue of Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousae* (cf. Ar. *Th.* 191f.: σὺ δ' εὐπρόσωπος, λευκός, ἐξυρημένος, / γυναικόφωνος, ἀπαλός, εὐπρεπὴς ἰδεῖν), see especially Pretagostini 1997.

48 [Arist.] *Pr.* 11.16. Similar formulations may be found in [Arist.] *Pr.* 11.34, 62.

Bibliography

- Arbò, A., Arbò, A. 2006. *Les animaux sont-ils musiciens? Autour d'un thème de la réflexion musicale antique*, in: Mortier-Waldschmidt, O. (éd.) *Musique et Antiquité* (Paris), 209-43.
- Aricò, G. 2008. *Lo «stridor» di Alceste*, in: Arduini, P. (cur.) *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli* (Roma), 57-61.
- Ax, W. 1978. *Ψόφος, φωνή und διάλεκτος als Grundbegriffe aristotelischer Sprachreflexion*, Glotta 56, 245-71.
- Bajoni, M.G. 2002. *Orfeo e la scimmia 'musicista' in un mosaico di Sousse* (Louvre, inv. MNC 1145; cat. Ma 1798), Scholia 11, 80-8.
- Barker, A. 1984. *Greek Musical Writings I: The Musician and his Art* (Cambridge).
- Barker, A. 2002. *Words for Sounds*, in: Tuplin, C.J., Rihll, T.E. (eds.) *Science and Mathematics in Ancient Greek Culture* (Oxford), 22-35.
- Barker, A. 2010. *Phōnaskia for singers and orators. The care and training of the voice in the Roman empire*, in: Rocconi, E. (cur.) *La musica dell'Impero romano. Testimonianze teoriche e scoperte archeologiche* (Pavia), 11-20.
- Belardi, W. 1975. *Il linguaggio nella filosofia di Aristotele* (Roma).
- Bettini, M. 1986. *Antropologia e cultura romana. Parentela, tempo, immagini dell'anima* (Roma).
- Bettini, M. 2008. *Voci. Antropologia sonora del mondo antico* (Torino).
- Bettini, M. 2014. *Comparazione*, in: Bettini, M., Short, W. (cur.) *Con i Romani. Un'antropologia della cultura antica* (Bologna), 23-44.
- Brillante, C. 2008. *La voce che affascina: Elena e Cleopatra*, MD 59, 53-75.
- Calame-Griaule, G. 1965. *Ethnologie et langage, la Parole chez les Dogon* (Paris).
- Calame-Griaule, G. 1993. *La nasalité et la mort*, in: Revel, N., Rey-Hulman, D. (éds.) *Pour une anthropologie des voix* (Paris), 23-33.
- Carson, A. 1994. *The Gender of Sound*, *Thamyris* 1, 10-31.
- Cèbe, J.-P. 1966. *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique dès origines à Juvénal* (Paris).
- Cimatti, F., Gensini, S., Plastina, S. (cur.) 2016. *Bestie, filosofi e altri animali* (Milano).
- Crippa, S. 2012. *Bruissements, gestes vocaux, cris. Pour une réflexion sur le contexte sonore des rituels 'magiques'*, in: Piranomonte, M., Simón, F.M. (cur.) *Contesti magici. Contextos mágicos* (Roma), 289-97.
- Crippa, S. 2015. *La voce. Sonorità e pensiero alle origini della cultura europea* (Milano).
- De Martino, F. 1995. *La voce degli autori*, in: De Martino, F., Sommerstein, A. (cur.) *Lo spettacolo delle voci* (Bari), 17-59.
- Dieterlen, G. 1989. *Masks and Mythology among the Dogon*, *African Arts* 22, 34-43, 87-8.
- Dieu, E. 2015. *Vocalisme et consonantisme expressifs dans le vocabulaire des sons inarticulés en grec ancien*, *Pallas* 98, 15-30.

- Forster, E.S. 1928. *The Pseudo-Aristotelian Problems: Their Nature and Composition*, CQ 22, 163-6.
- Franco, C. 2007. *Callimaco e la voce del cane*, in: Andrisano, A.M. (cur.) *Animali, animali fantastici, ibridi, mostri* (Ferrara), 45-68.
- Garezou, M.-X. 1994, in: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 7, 81-105, s.v. Orpheus.
- Garofalo, I. 1991. *The Six Classes of Animals in Galen*, in: López Férez, J.A. (ed.) *Galen. Obra, pensamiento e influencia* (Madrid), 73-87.
- Goblot-Cahen, C. 2007. *Le héraut à la frontière entre les genres*, in: Sébillotte Cuchet, V., Ernoult, N. (éds.) *Problèmes du genre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris), 261-75.
- Grant, R.L. 1960. *Antyllus and his Medical Work*, BHM 34, 154-74.
- Hjelmstev, L.T. 1954. *La stratification du langage*, Word 10, 163-88.
- Kaimio, M. 1977. *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature* (Helsinki).
- Labarrière, J.-L. 2004. *Langage, vie politique et mouvement des animaux. Études aristotéliennes* (Paris).
- Lachenaud, G. 2013. *Les routes de la voix: l'Antiquité grecque et le mystère de la voix* (Paris).
- Lestel, D. 1995. *Paroles de singes. L'impossible dialogue homme-primate* (Paris).
- Lestel, D. 2001. *Les origines animales de la culture* (Paris).
- Liatsi, M. 2000. *Aristoteles, De Generatione animalium, Buch V. Einleitung und Kommentar* (Trier).
- Mâche, F.-B. 1991. *Musique, mythe, nature ou les dauphins d'Arion* (Paris).
- Manetti, G. 1993. *Theories of the Sign in Classical Antiquity* (Bloomington/Indianapolis).
- McDermott, W.C. 1938. *The Ape in Antiquity* (Baltimore).
- Normand, H. 2015. *Les rapaces dans les mondes grec et romain. Catégorisation, représentations culturelles et pratiques* (Bordeaux).
- Perrot, S. 2012. *Le sifflement du serpent, du langage inarticulé à la mise en musique*, Anthropolozologica 47, 345-61.
- Petrucchi, F.M. 2011. *Una traccia della dialettica scolastica del primo Peripato: le sezioni musicali dei Problemata Physica (XI e XIX)*, in: Centrone, B. (cur.) *Studi sui Problemata Physica aristotelici* (Napoli), 175-238.
- Pretagostini, R. 1997. *L'omosessualità di Agatone nelle Tesmoforiazuse di Aristofane e la figura del κελητίζεν*, in: D'Alessandro, P. (cur.) *ΜΟΥΣΑ. Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli* (Bologna), 117-22.
- Rocconi, E. 2003a. *Le parole delle Muse. La formazione del lessico tecnico musicale nella Grecia antica* (Roma).
- Rocconi, E. 2003b. *The Development of Vertical Orientation in the Spatial Representation of Sound*, in: Hickmann, E., Kilmer, A., Eichmann, R. (eds.) *The Archeology of Early*

- Sound: Origin and Organization*, Studien zu Musikarchäologie 3 (Rahden/Westf.), 389-92.
- Rocconi, E. 2016. *Patterns of Sound Classification in Greek Antiquity. The Quality of Ligytrotēs*, in: Eichman, R., Koch, L.-Ch., Fang, J. (eds.) *Sound-Object-Culture-History*, Studien zu Musikarchäologie 10 (Rahden/Westf.), 35-42.
- Sébillotte-Cuchet, V. 2003. *Cris de femmes, cris d'hommes. Éléments de critique pour l'interprétation du cri en Grèce ancienne*, in: Lett, D., Offenstadt, N. (éds.) *Haro ! Noël ! Oyé ! Pratiques du cri au Moyen Âge* (Paris), 205-16.
- Stramaglia, A. 1995. *Le voci dei fantasmi*, in: De Martino, F., Sommerstein, A. (cur.) *Lo spettacolo delle voci* (Bari), 193-230.
- Trager, G.L. 1958. *Paralanguage: A First Approximation*, *Studies in Linguistics* 13, 1-12.
- Vendries, C. 2002. *Harpistes, Luthistes et Citharôdes dans l'Égypte romaine. Remarques sur certaines singularités musicales*, *RBPH* 80, 171-98.
- Wackernagel, W. 1867. *Voces variae animantium. Ein Beitrag zur Naturkunde und zur Geschichte der Sprache* (Basel).
- West, M.L. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).
- Zucker, A. 2005. *Les classes zoologiques en Grèce ancienne d'Homère à Élien (VIII^e av.-III^e ap.J.-C.)* (Aix-en-Provence).

Stinging Auloi

Aristophanes, Acharnians 860–71

Timothy J. Moore

Washington University in St. Louis, USA

tmoore26@wustl.edu

Abstract

When Dikaiopolis calls the *auletai* accompanying the Theban who comes to trade with him wasps (*Ach.* 864), he responds in part to a buzz-like sound produced by their *auloi*. Contributing to the instruments' buzzing may have been dissonance caused by so many pipes played at once, the pipes' material (bone), and a playing technique that placed emphasis on the lowest notes. The instruments' music is out of place because the scene is in iambic trimeters, which were almost always performed without accompaniment. Dikaiopolis also calls the *auletai* wasps because their arrival reminds him of the Spartan army, which regularly marched, fought, and performed rituals to the accompaniment of multiple *auloi*.

Keywords

aulos – Aristophanes – Athens – Sparta – Thebes – wasps – *auletes* – music in theater

After he has made his own private peace with the Spartans in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, Dikaiopolis sets up a market where he can deal in goods otherwise banned because of the war, and various characters come to trade with him. One of those characters is a Theban, joined by his slave Hismenias and a group of *auletai*. Dikaiopolis enters from his house in response to the sound of the *auloi* (860–71):

Βοιωτός. ἴττω Ἡρακλῆς, ἔκαμόν γα τὰν τύλαν κακῶς.
κατάθου τὸ τὰν γλάχων' ἀτρέμας, Ἴσμηνία·
ὕμεις δ', ὅσοι Θεῖβαθεν αὐλῆται πάρα,
τοῖς ὁστίνοις φυσεῖτε τὸν πρωκτὸν κυνός.

860

Δικαιοπόλις. παῦ' ἐς κόρακας. οἱ σφήκες οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν θυρῶν;
 πόθεν προσέπτανθ' οἱ κακῶς ἀπολούμενοι 865
 ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν μοι Χαριδῆς βομβαύλιοι;
 Βοιωτός. νεί τὸν Ἰόλαον, ἐπεχαρίττω γ', ὦ ξένε·
 Θείβαθε γὰρ φυσάντες ἐξόπισθέ μου
 τάνθεια τὰς γλάχωνος ἀπέκιξαν χαμαί.
 ἀλλ' αἶ τι βούλει, πρίασο τῶν ἰὼ φέρω,
 τῶν ὀρταλίων ἢ τῶν τετραπτερυλλίδων.¹

THEBAN: As Heracles is my witness, the callus on my shoulder is utterly worn out. Hismenias, put down the pennyroyal² very carefully. And you, such *aulos* players as are here from Thebes, play the arse of the dog with your bone pipes.

DIKAIOPOLIS: Stop that racket and go to hell! Get those wasps away from the door! Where did those goddamn *aulos*-buzzing³ sons of Chairis⁴ come from to my door?

THEBAN: By Iolaus, you have done me a favor, stranger. Those guys, puffing behind me all the way from Thebes, knocked the flowers of my pennyroyal on the ground. But if you wish, buy some of the wares I have brought, either the little birds or the little four-winged creatures.

Dikaiopolis calls the *auletai* wasps, and it is probable that the Theban does as well. It is difficult to make sense of the *hapax legomenon* with which he ends the passage quoted here: τετραπτερυλλίδων or 'little four-winged creatures'. We would expect 'four-footed creatures' to contrast with ὀρταλίχων, birds. De Cremoux (2009) has noted that τετραπτερυλλίδης is a diminutive of τετράπτερος, 'four-winged creatures', which is used of wasps in Sophocles (fr. 29 Radt) and of bees in Aristotle (*HA* 532a 21, *PA* 682b8). The Theban thus agrees with Dikaiopolis' description of the *auletai* as wasps and, either sincerely or ironically, offers to sell them to him. What is so wasp-like about these *auletai*? The various possible answers to that question can shed some light both on

1 The text is that of Olson 2002, and Olson's commentary (2002, 71, 287-90) is the principal source of the explanations in notes 2-4 below. All translations are my own. On the Theban's Boeotian dialect, see Colvin 1999, 129-32 and *passim*.

2 Γλάχων, which in Attic would be βλήχων and is here translated, 'pennyroyal', is a kind of mint, which the Theban thinks will bring him a good price in Athens.

3 Βομβαύλιοι is a pun on βομβοῦλιος, a type of bumble bee, and *aulos*.

4 Chairis was a player of both the *aulos* and the *kithara*, whom Aristophanic characters insult elsewhere (*Ach.* 16, *Pax* 941-5, *Av.* 858-9).

this scene and on the sound of the *aulos* and its role in fifth-century Athenian theater and life.

Key to our understanding of the passage is how we interpret the phrase *φυσείτε τὸν πρωκτὸν κυνός*, ‘play the arse of the dog,’ in verse 863. Van Leeuwen (1901, 144) and Rogers (1910, 134) followed Bergler’s proposal that ‘the arse of a dog’ is a bagpipe made out of dog’s hide; but that seems improbable, given the absence of any clear references to bagpipes before the late Hellenistic period⁵ and the unlikelihood of a bagpipe’s bag made from dog-skin (West 1992, 109 n. 121; Campos Calvo-Sotelo 2015, 34). A second suggestion is that ‘The Arse of the Dog’ is the name of a song the *auletai* are to play. Starkie, for example, suggests that it may be “a well-known vulgar ditty, which was known by its first words” (1909, 178; cf. Sommerstein 1980, 200). Olson notes, however, that elsewhere Aristophanes uses *φυσάω* of *aulos* playing only in pejorative contexts (Olson 2002, 288), and he points to two significant parallels. Asked in Aristophanes’ *Ecclesiazusae* what she will do if a certain Niocleides insults her, Praxagora responds, *τούτῳ μὲν εἶπον ἐς κυνὸς πυγὴν ὀρᾶν* (255), ‘I hereby tell him to look up a dog’s arse’. The scholiast to our passage cites the *Ecclesiazusae* passage along with a proverb allegedly said to people who did not see well: *ἐς πρωκτὸν κυνὸς βλέπε*, ‘look up the arse of a dog’. The implication appears to be that they would see no better there. The hero of pseudo-Lucian’s *Ass* refers to escaping *ἐκ κυνὸς πρωκτοῦ*, *τὸ δὴ τοῦ λόγου*, ‘from the proverbial dog’s arse, as the saying goes’ (*Asin.* 56). Olson concludes: “‘The dog’s arse’ is thus a dark place from where an unwanted or inconvenient individual or object can be made to disappear and the Boiotian must mean something like ‘For your next number, how about ‘Stick It Where the Sun Never Shines?’” (2002, 288–9; cf. Rennie 1909, 219; Brown 2008, 352).

Olson’s persuasive interpretation has two important implications for the role and effect of the *auletai* in this scene. First, it means that in spite of what the words seem to say at first glance, the Theban does not call upon the *auletai* to start playing, but rather to stop: they have been playing since his entrance. Indeed, he later suggests that they have been playing since he left Thebes (*Θεῖβαθε γὰρ φυσᾶντες ἐξόπισθέ μου*, 868). Second, it means that the Theban himself is exasperated with the *auletai* even before Dikaiopolis complains about them. His gratitude to Dikaiopolis after the Athenian has quieted the *auletai* (867) is therefore sincere, not a lie to win over his potential trading partner (pace van Leeuwen 1901, 145).

Dikaiopolis’ insult suggests that these *auloi*, like wasps, are buzzing. Double-reed instruments like the *aulos* can produce a tone that can easily be compared to the buzzing of bees or wasps, even when just one pipe is played, as in some

5 It is possible that the *φυσάλλας* someone is ordered to play at *Lysistrata* 1245 is a bagpipe, but the identity of the instrument referred to is not clear. Cf. Campos Calvo-Sotelo 2015, 33–4.

types of shawm. When two pipes are played together, unless they are perfectly in tune, they would produce a buzzing dissonance each time both played the same note.⁶ Here there are not just two pipes being played together, but a number of pipes: the buzz-like dissonance would be multiplied. The dissonance would presumably have been kept to a minimum by the very best *auletai*. But there is considerable doubt that such *auletai* would be available for this scene. The star *auletai* who served as the official accompanists for dithyramb, comedy, and tragedy were expensive: Wilson (2008, 108) guesses that each would have cost about 1,000 drachmas per festival.⁷ The *choregos* of *Acharnians* might perhaps have hired a number of such stars for this very brief performance in a gesture of extravagance (so Ewans 2011, 217). But more likely, for such a short-lived moment of music in which the instruments are to annoy rather than to please, he would have settled for less expensive, and therefore less accomplished, musicians. A high degree of buzzing dissonance was probably inevitable, even if it was not (as seems likely) produced intentionally.⁸

Physical aspects of these particular *auloi* may also have contributed to a wasp-like effect. The Theban refers to the pipes as τοῖς ὀστίνοις, the things made of bone. Words of this nature often serve as simple metonymy for pipes in general, but the text may imply that the Theban's *auletai* play specifically *auloi* wholly or partially made of bone, as opposed to other materials such as wood, reed, or metal. Bone may have brought a particular stridency that made the wasp image especially apt.⁹

The *auletai*'s technique may also have encouraged the wasp analogy. Hesychius' *Lexicon* gives the following definition of σφηκισμός, or wasping: εἶδος ἀυλῆσεως εἰρημένον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμφερείας τῶν βομβῶν, 'a form of *aulos*-playing named from its likeness to buzzing' (Σ 2886). Perhaps the *auletai* affect Dikaiopolis like wasps in part because they are using whatever this technique was. Words for buzzing, when used of *auloi*, seem especially to be associated with the instrument's lowest notes. The word βόμβυξ, closely related etymologically to Dikaiopolis' βομβάυλιος, is used both for a type of wasp (Davies and Kathirithamby 1986, 72-3) and in connection with low sounds

6 Note the decidedly buzz-like sound of the three-pipe Sardinian *launeddas*.

7 It appears that *auletai* were originally paid by the poet, but that by the mid fifth century they were allotted to each production by the *polis*, after which time they were paid either by the state (so Wilson 2008, 108) or the *choregoi* (so Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 88; Wilson 2000, 69).

8 On the distinction between star *auletai* and their less distinguished colleagues, see Apul. *Fl.* 4, where it is reported that the great fourth-century-BCE *auletes* Antigenidas said he hated nothing more than when the musicians who played *auloi* at funerals were called *auletai*. Cf. Scheithauer 2015, 55.

9 Juba (*FGrH* 275 F 82) claimed that the *aulos* made from bones of a fawn is an invention of the Thebans.

coming from *auloi*. The author of the pseudo-Aristotelian *De audibilibus* discusses the difficulty of filling the βόμβυκες of *auloi* with air (800b). He may be discussing the pipes of *auloi* in general, but more likely he refers to a type of pipe that is longer and therefore both more difficult to fill with air and productive of deeper tones.¹⁰ Aristotle himself refers to movement ἀπὸ τοῦ βόμβυκος ἐπὶ τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἐν αὐλοῖς, ‘from the βόμβυξ to the highest in *auloi*’ (*Metaph.* 1093b). Βόμβυξ here is evidently the hole that produces the pipe’s lowest note.¹¹ Perhaps then, the Theban’s *auletai* are placing special emphasis on their instruments’ lowest tones, using a version of the technique Hesychius would later call σφηκισμός.

Whatever its specific nature, the sound of these *auletai* would also have been jarring because it competes with the scene’s meter. This scene is in iambic trimeters. With very rare exceptions, iambic trimeters in Greek theater were spoken without accompaniment, but the official *auletes* of the production generally played when other meters were used (Moore 2008, 6–11). Thus, for example, in *Birds* the meter changes from lyric meters to iambic trimeters as Peisetairos stops an *auletes* (whom the chorus identifies as Chairis) from playing and then mocks him (858–61):

<p>Χορός. συναυλεῖτω δὲ Χαίρις ᾧδᾶ. Πεισέταιρος. παύσαι σὺ φυσῶν. Ἡράκλεις, τουτὶ τί ἦν; τουτὶ μὰ Δί’ ἐγὼ πολλὰ δὴ καὶ δεῖν’ ἰδῶν οὐπω κόρακ’ εἶδον ἐμπεφορβειωμένον.¹²</p>	<p>bacchiacs and cretic iambic trimeter</p>
---	--

CHORUS: Let Chairis play along with the song.

PEISETAIROS: You, stop puffing. By Heracles, what is this business? By Zeus, I have seen many awesome things, but I have never seen a crow wearing a *phorbeia*.

10 Cf. Barker 1989, 100 n. 7. Pollux appears at one point to use βόμβυκες generically for the pipes of *auloi* (4.70), but elsewhere he describes βόμβυκες as a type of *auloi* especially conducive to the orgiastic: τῶν δὲ βομβύκων ἔνθεον καὶ μανικὸν τὸ αὐλημα, πρέπον ὀργίοις (‘the *aulos* playing of βόμβυκες is god-inspired and inclined to madness, and appropriate for orgiastic rites’, 4.82). Aeschylus uses βόμβυκες of pipes of *auloi* in a Dionysiac context (fr. 57 Radt); and Plutarch lists βόμβυκες along with πολυχорδαῖα as elements of *aulos* playing that can stir up the soul (*Quaest. Conv.* 713a).

11 Cf. Alex. Aphr. in *Mete.* 835.6: βόμβυκα δὲ λέγει τὸ μέγιστον καὶ πρῶτον ἐν τῷ αὐλῷ τρύπημα, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ ὁ μέγιστος καὶ ὁ βαρύτερος ἦχος ἀποτελεῖται, ‘He says that the *bombux* is the biggest and first hole in the *aulos*, from which both the loudest and deepest sound is produced’. See also Nicom. *Harm.* 5 and 11, where a deeper tone is described as βομβυκέστερος.

12 Text and scansion from Dunbar 1995.

As they performed in meters other than iambic trimeters, the vocal performance of the actors would have changed to match the accompanying *aulos*, either to song or to some kind of chanting. Other scenes suggest that in passages of Greek comedy where an *auletes* continues to play while the actors perform iambic trimeters, the result could be farcical, as actors, rather than singing or chanting the way they usually do when *auletai* accompany them, would need to shout over the *aulos*.

Trying to rescue his hapless relative in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*, Euripides has a dancing girl, accompanied by an *aulos* player, distract the Scythian archer who is keeping guard over him. In a passage in iambic trimeters, he orders the *aulos* player to play; and he is clearly obeyed, as the Scythian reacts with τί τὸ βόμβο τοῦτο; 'what is this buzzing?' (1176). The accompanied iambic trimeters continue as the dancing girl succeeds in leading the Scythian archer off and Euripides orders the *aulos* player to follow them. During the whole scene, the actors would need to shout over the *aulos*, contributing to the scene's uproarious sense of chaos.

Menander uses accompanied iambic trimeters to similar effect in *Dyskolos*. Entering to conduct her worship for Pan, Sostratos' mother commands an *auletris* named Parthenis to play (432-4):

αὔλει, Παρθενί,
Πανός· σιωπῇ, φασί, τούτῳ τῷ θεῷ
οὐ δεῖ προσιέναι.

Play Pan's song on the *aulos*, Parthenis. They say that it is not right to approach this god in silence.

Sostratos' superstitious mother, who gallivants around the country making sacrifices in response to dreams, is a source of much humor. Here she and her large entourage of fellow worshippers create a farcical effect as they barge into the tranquil country scene that is the play's setting and disturb the misanthrope Knemon, whose first reaction to their arrival is,

τουτὶ τὸ κακὸν τί βούλεται;
ὄχλος τις· ἅπαγ' ἐς κόρακας.

What the devil is this? It's some mob. Go to hell! (431-2).

Contributing to the fun is the fact that characters in the ensuing dialogue must shout over the accompanying *aulos*.

An apparent exception to this pattern occurs in *Frogs*, at the entrance of the chorus of initiates of the Eleusinian Mysteries (312-5):

Χανθίας: οὔτος.

Διόνυσος: τί ἔστιν;

Χανθίας: οὐ κατήκουσας;

Διόνυσος: τίνος;

Χανθίας: αὐλῶν πνοῆς.

Διόνυσος: ἔγωγε, καὶ δάδων γέ με

αὔρα τις εἰσέπνευσε μυστικωτάτη.

ἀλλ' ἡρεμεί πτήξαντες ἀχροασώμεθα.

XANTHIAS: Hey!

DIONYSUS: What is it?

XANTHIAS: Didn't you hear?

DIONYSUS: Hear what?

XANTHIAS: The breath of *auloi*.

DIONYSUS: I did. And a mystic breath of torches blew upon me. Let's settle down here and listen a bit.¹³

For Dionysus and Xanthias the sound of an *aulos*, played during iambic trimeters, appears to be a source of pleasure rather than annoyance, and there is no indication that the scene is farcical. Here, though, the *aulos* is envisioned as being at a distance and therefore not as loud as a nearer *aulos* would be.¹⁴ In our scene the *auloi* are very near, and the Theban and Dikaiopolis must shout even louder than the characters in *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Dyskolos*, as they are accompanied by not just one, but a number of *auletai*.

All these factors may have contributed to making the Theban's *auletai* wasp-like to the ears of Dikaiopolis, the Theban, and the audience. But it is likely that the very presence of so many *auletai* playing together, as much as any specific qualities of their sound, inspires Dikaiopolis to compare them to wasps. Wasps are hateful primarily not because they buzz, but because they sting. They are an unwelcome nuisance and a threat, notorious in the ancient world not only for their stinging, but also for their alleged practice of driving off bees from their hives (Davies and Kathirithamby 1986, 75-6; Beavis 1988, 193). Aelian even

13 On the attribution of verses here, see Dover 1993, 232.

14 An anonymous reader for *GRMS* points out that another factor changing the effect of the *aulos* music here is Dionysus' own close association both with the *aulos* and with the Eleusinian Mysteries in his role as Iacchus.

records a story of a whole people being driven from their homes by a swarm of wasps (NA 11.28). To Dikaiopolis, these *auletai* would sound not just obnoxious, but ominous.

Dikaiopolis and the audience would have been very accustomed to *aulos* music, which accompanied theater and the dithyramb, symposia, sacrifices and processions, and numerous other occasions in fifth-century Athens (Wilson 1999, 75-85). On nearly all those occasions, however, Athenians probably heard just one *auletes* playing at a time. The overwhelming majority of literary passages describing *aulos* music in this period refer to just one *aulos* being played; and almost all extant portrayals of *auletai* in action show just one *auletes* playing. The author of the pseudo-Aristotelian/Peripatetic *Problems* claims that at least for accompaniment of the voice, one instrument is better than multiple ones (19.9).

The most important exception to this tendency within Athens appears to have been the Panathenaia. Pollux includes συναυλία among styles of playing the *aulos* (4.83):

Ἀθήνησι δὲ καὶ συναυλία τις ἐκαλεῖτο· συμφωνία τις αὕτη τῶν ἐν Παναθηναίοις συναυλούντων.

At Athens there was also a certain way of playing called συναυλία. This was a certain combination of sounds produced when *auloi* played together at the Panathenaia.

Pollux appears to suggest that in an Athenian context the simultaneous playing of more than one *aulos* is associated specifically with the Panathenaia. Two *auletai* playing together in two red-figure vases—an amphora of the second quarter of the fifth century BCE by the Pan painter (Naples, Museo Archaeologico 225) and a *pelike* of around 430 (London 1910.6-15.1)—are probably competing at the Panathenaia (Ercoles 2006, 342, 367-9; cf. Wegner 1963, 72-3; Kotsidu 1991, 58 and passim).¹⁵ Pairs of *auletai* who play, along with cithara players, on a band cup of about 560 and a black-figure amphora of the third fourth of the sixth century BCE (Berlin, Staatliche Museen 1686) are probably in the Panathenaic procession (Shapiro 1992, 54-5). Jacques Carrey's drawings suggest that a now-lost portion of the Parthenon Frieze included four *auletai*, all playing, in the Panathenaic procession shown there (Jenkins 1994, 86; Neils 2001, 142-6; Shapiro 1992, 55).

15 On the term συναυλία and its development over time, see Ercoles 2006 and Grandolini 2007.

We occasionally find *auletai* in pairs elsewhere in Athenian art. A red figure krater attributed to Euphronios (late sixth century BCE), for example, shows two men playing *auloi* and a third playing a *barbitos* (Arezzo, Museo Nazionale Archeologico 1465).¹⁶ Examples of more than two *auletai* playing simultaneously, however, are exceedingly rare.¹⁷ For an Athenian of Aristophanes' day the sound of many *auletai* playing together would have been striking and unusual.¹⁸

There was one context, however, in which Dikaiopolis and his audience could have heard multiple *auloi* with some regularity: in battle with or when escaping from the Spartan army. Accompaniment by *auloi* was a signature feature of Spartan military practice (Gostoli 1988, 231; Wallace 2015, 72). While some passages citing the practice do not establish how many *auloi* were played at once in this context, others make clear that as Sparta waged war, many *auletai* often played simultaneously. Polyaeus' aetiological story explaining why Spartans always used *auloi* in their army begins with an emphasis on multiple *auletai* (1.10):

Προκλῆς καὶ Τήμενος Ἡρακλεΐδαι Εὐρυσθεΐδαις κατέχουσι τὴν Σπάρτην ἐπολέμουν. Ἡρακλεΐδαι μὲν δὴ ἔθυσον τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τῶν ὀρίων ὑπερβατήρια, Εὐρυσθεΐδαι δὲ ἄφνω προσέπιπτον ἐς μάχην· οὐ μὴν ἡρέθησαν Ἡρακλεΐδαι, ἀλλὰ τοὺς αὐλητὰς, ὡς εἶχον, ἡγείσθαι κελεύουσιν. οἱ μὲν τοῖς αὐλοῖς ἐμπνέοντες ἡγοῦντο, οἱ δὲ ὀπλῖται πρὸς τὸ μέλος καὶ τὸν ρυθμὸν ἐμβαίνοντες ἄρρηκτοι τὴν τάξιν ἐγένοντο καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους ἐνίκησαν.

Procles and Temenos, sons of Heracles, were waging war against the sons of Eurystheus, who held Sparta. The Heracleidai were sacrificing to Athena, asking for safe passage over the mountains, and the Eurystheidai suddenly attacked them. The Heracleidai were not disconcerted, but they ordered their *auletai*, as they were, to lead. The *auletai* led, blowing on their *auloi*, and the hoplites marching to their melody and rhythm held their battle line unbroken and defeated the enemy.

16 I am grateful to Dereck Basinger for this reference.

17 Aristophanes himself may have used multiple *auloi* for an extraordinary effect in *Birds*. Four individual birds enter and are described before that play's *parodos* (269ff.). It is possible that the four birds are four separate *auletai*, who would then all accompany the ensuing choruses (see Corbel-Morana 2012, 290-3 and the works cited there).

18 In contrast to Rome, where multiple *tibiae* playing together seems to have been common. Note the provision in the Twelve Tables forbidding more than ten *tibicines* to accompany a funeral (Cic. *Leg.* 2.59), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus' description of multiple *auletai* in a procession at *ludi* (*Ant. Rom.* 7.72.13).

Xenophon reports multiple *auletai* playing together immediately before battle in his account of Lycurgus' laws (*Lac.* 13.8):

ὅταν γὰρ ὁρώντων ἤδη τῶν πολεμίων χίμαιρα σφαγιάζεται, αὐλεῖν τε πάντας τοὺς παρόντας αὐλητάς νόμος ...

For whenever the enemy is within sight and a goat is sacrificed, it is customary that all the *auletai* present play (cf. *Plu. Lyc.* 22.2).

Thucydides describes multiple *auletai* playing together as the Spartans marched into battle (5.70):

Ἀργεῖοι μὲν καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἐντόνως καὶ ὀργῇ χωροῦντες, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ βραδέως καὶ ὑπὸ αὐλητῶν πολλῶν νόμῳ ἐγκαθεστῶτων ...

The Argives and their allies went eagerly and in anger, but the Lacedaimonians went slowly, to the accompaniment of many *auletai*, placed there according to custom.¹⁹

Xenophon's Agesilaus orders that all his *auletai* play to celebrate a victory (*HG* 4.3.21):

ἐκέλευε ... στεφανοῦσθαι πάντας τῷ θεῷ καὶ τοὺς αὐλητάς πάντας αὐλεῖν.

He ordered ... all to crown themselves in honor of the god, and all the *auletai* to play (cf. *Plu. Ages.* 19.2).

Lysander thus used a (mocking?) variation of standard Spartan military practice when, after the Spartan victory in the Peloponnesian War, he had the walls of Athens torn down to the accompaniment of *auletrides* (*X. HG* 2.2.23; *Plu. Lys.* 15.4).

The Theban's *auloi* are not specifically martial; and they are Theban, not Spartan. But they match the *auloi* of the attacking Spartan army in three important respects: they were probably unusually loud, there are a lot of them, and they arrive without warning. Dikaiopolis is from Cholleidai, about ten kilometers north of Athens (Pöhlmann 1989, 100). He would have personal experience of Spartan armies, accompanied by *auletai*, coming like the Theban from

19 Cf. Athenaeus 627d. Pausanias reports that they marched into battle not just with multiple *auloi* but with lyres and kitharas as well (3.17.5).

the direction of Thebes. As much as he responds to any specific features of their sound, therefore, Dikaiopolis lashes out against the *auletai* because they remind him of the Spartan armies who have been invading Attica each year since the war began. Like swarming wasps, the *auloi*-led Spartans have been driving him from his home.

We might well ask why the Theban brought these *auletai*, if they were to have such a negative effect on his potential trading partner. One possibility is that the *auletai* pursued him against his will. Thebes, after all, is still at war with Athens, so the *auletai* may represent the hostile city of Thebes as a whole, pursuing and annoying their fellow citizen who dares to trade with the enemy. More likely, however, we should envision the Theban as having willingly brought along his parade of *auletai*, an error of judgment that results both from his ethnicity and his foolishness. Thebans were well known throughout antiquity for their excessive love of the *aulos* (Roesch 1989), a feature of their society for which Athenians mocked them.²⁰ This particular Theban is not very smart: later in the scene he will trade all his goods for an informer, surely one of the most lopsided exchanges ever portrayed on the stage. The Theban wants to make a great impression, so he has decided to bring along not just one or two, but a group of *auletai*, one of the prized features of his native city. To make the biggest possible splash, he has them accompany him the whole way from Thebes. If we are to take his offer of 'little four-winged creatures' in verse 871 as sincere rather than ironic, he may even have believed he could make some money by selling the *auletai* to Dikaiopolis. He thus made two major miscalculations. First, he failed to realize that even for an *aulos*-loving Theban, a group of only moderately talented *auletai* playing all the way from Thebes to Athens would get pretty obnoxious. Second, he forgot what should have been obvious. To an Athenian—especially one from the countryside—an unexpected procession involving multiple *auletai* would conjure up images not of abundant goods for sale, but of the army that had been harassing him for years.

The Theban's *auletai*, then, are wasp-like partly because they buzz. But more importantly for Dikaiopolis and the audience they are wasp-like because they sting, recalling the devastations of the Spartan army that Dikaiopolis' fantastic private peace was trying to make them forget.

20 Note, for example, Alcibiades' alleged claims that the Thebans loved playing *auloi* so much because they could not hold a conversation (Plu. *Alc.* 2.6).

Bibliography

- Barker, A. 1989. *Greek Musical Writings II: Harmonic and Acoustic Theory* (Cambridge).
- Beavis, I.C. 1988. *Insects and Other Invertebrates in Classical Antiquity* (Exeter).
- Brown, P. 2008. *Scenes at the Door in Aristophanic Comedy*, in: Revermann, M., Wilson, P. (eds.) *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford), 349-73.
- Campos Calvo-Sotelo, J. 2015. *Around the Origins of Bagpipes: Relevant Hypotheses and Evidences*, GRMS 3, 18-52.
- Colvin, S. 1999. *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford).
- Corbel-Morana, C. 2012. *Le Bestiaire d'Aristophane* (Paris).
- Davies, M., Kathirithamby J. 1986. *Greek Insects* (Oxford).
- de Cremoux, A. 2009. *D'étrange tétraptères* (Aristoph. Ach. 871), QUCC 92, 87-93.
- Dover, K. (ed.) 1993. *Aristophanes Frogs* (Oxford).
- Dunbar, N. (ed.) 1995. *Aristophanes Birds* (Oxford).
- Ercoles, M. 2006. *Συναυλία: Storia di una pratica musicale e vicissitudini di un termine*, Eikasmos 17, 339-70.
- Ewans, M. (ed.) 2011. *Aristophanes: Acharnians, Knights, and Peace* (Norman, OK).
- Gostoli, A. 1988. *Terpando e la funzione etico-politica della musica nella cultura spartana del VII sec. A.C.*, in: Gentili, B., Pretagostini, R. (eds.) *La musica in Grecia* (Bari), 231-7.
- Grandolini, S. 2007. *Sulla synaulia*, Nova Tellus 25, 137-53.
- Jenkins, I. 1994. *The Parthenon Frieze* (Austin, TX).
- Kotsidu, H. 1991. *Die musischen Agone der Panathenäen in archaischer und klassischer Zeit: Eine historisch-archäologische Untersuchung* (Munich).
- Moore, T.J. 2008. *When Did the Tibicen Play? Meter and Musical Accompaniment in Roman Comedy*, TAPhA 138, 3-46.
- Neils, J. 2001. *The Parthenon Frieze* (Cambridge, Eng.).
- Olson, S.D. (ed.) 2002. *Aristophanes Acharnians* (Oxford).
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. 2nd edition, revised by J. Gould and D.M. Lewis (Oxford).
- Pöhlmann, E. 1989. *Scene di ricerca e di inseguimento nel teatro attico del quinto e quarto secolo. (La tecnica teatrale delle Eumenidi, dell'Aiace, degli Acharnesi e del Reso)*, in: De Finis, L. (ed.) *Scena e spettacolo nell'antichità: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio, Trento, 28-30 marzo 1988* (Florence), 89-109.
- Radt, S. (ed.) 1985. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 3: *Aeschylus* (Göttingen).
- Radt, S. (ed.) 1977. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 4: *Sophocles* (Göttingen).
- Rennie, W. 1909. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London).

- Roesch, P. 1989. *L'aulos et les aulètes en Béotie*, in: Beister, H., Buckler, J. (eds.) *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Bötien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer* (Munich), 203-14.
- Rogers, B.B. (ed.) 1910. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*. Vol 1: *The Acharnians. The Knights* (London).
- Scheithauer, A. 2015. *Die Welt der Auleten: Musikerkarrieren im griechischen Kulturkreis* (Frankfurt).
- Shapiro, H.A. 1992. *Mousikoi Agones: Music and Poetry at the Panathenaia*, in: Neils J. (ed.) *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Princeton), 52-75.
- Sommerstein, A.H. (ed.) 1980. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, vol. 1: *Acharnians* (Warminster, Eng.).
- Starkie, W.J.M. (ed.) 1909. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (London).
- van Leeuwen, J. (ed.) 1901. *Aristophanis Acharnenses*. 2nd edition (Leiden).
- Wallace, R.W. 2015. *Reconstructing Damon: Music, Wisdom Teaching, and Politics in Perikles' Athens* (Oxford).
- Wegner, M. 1963. *Griechenland. Musikgeschichte in Bildern*, ed. by H. Bessler and M. Schneider, Band 2: *Musik des Altertums*, Lieferung 4 (Leipzig).
- West, M.L. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).
- Wilson, P. 1999. *The Aulos in Athens*, in: Goldhill, S., Osborne, R. (eds.) *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge, Eng.), 58-95.
- Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City, and the Stage* (Cambridge, Eng.).
- Wilson, P. 2008. *Costing the Dionysia*, in: Revermann, M., Wilson, P. (eds.) *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford), 88-127.

The Monody of the Hoopoe in Aristophanes' *Birds* 227-62

Egert Pöhlmann

Universitaet Erlangen, Germany

eva.poehlmann@t-online.de

Abstract

Animal choruses are familiar in ancient Greek comedy. Besides Aristophanes, there are 13 examples of them. Vase paintings provide evidence from the beginnings of Old Comedy. They had to sing the traditional melic parts of the agon and the parabasis. Aristophanes used the comic animal chorus in *Knights* (424 BC), *Wasps* (422), *Birds* (414), *Frogs* (405) and *Storks* (395-387). Moreover, with the song of the Hoopoe in the *Birds* 227-62, Aristophanes presents an animal as soloist which sings an extended monody, a perfect example of the *astrophia*, the structure of which is defined by content, changes of metre and probably of music, but not by alternating strophes and antistrophes. It can be demonstrated that the Hoopoe's monody follows the model of the late *astrophic* monodies of Euripides and mirrors the *astrophic* structures of the New Dithyramb, later parodied by Aristophanes (*Birds* 1373-1409) in the person of the dithyrambic poet Cinesias.

Keywords

astrophic lyric – Euripides, monodies – Aristophanes, parodies of Euripides' monodies – New Dithyramb – sounds of animals in New Music

1 Introduction

Animal choruses are familiar in ancient Greek comedy. Besides Aristophanes, we have 13 examples: the *Fishes* of Archippus, the *Nightingales* and the *Ants* of Cantharus, the *Animals* of Crates, the *Goats* of Eupolis, the *Frogs* of Magnes, the *Frogs* of Callias, the *Griffins* and the *Ants* of Plato, the *Bees* of Diocles, the

Ants of Cantharus, the *Birds* of Magnes, the *Birds* of Crates and the *Gall-Wasps* of Magnes. Vase paintings provide evidence that animal choruses belong to the stock of Old Comedy from its beginnings.¹ Like other choruses, the animal choruses had to sing the melic parts of the *agon* and the *parabasis*, namely the *ode* and *antode*.

Aristophanes used the time-honoured requisite of the comic animal chorus already in the *Knights* (424 BC), where a chorus of Athenian ἵππεις with their horses appears on the stage. In the *Wasps* (422 BC) the lay judges of the *Heliaia* are disguised as Σφῆκες. In the *Frogs* (405 BC) the secondary chorus of the βάρβαροι has to sing an extended parodic *amoibaion* with Dionysus at the beginning of the comedy, while the main chorus, an Eleusinian procession of worshippers of Dionysus, appears later (325 ff.). Finally, in the *Storks* (395-387 BC) the chorus of the Πέλαργοι renews the idea of the chorus of Ὀρνίθες, which Aristophanes had already used in his *Birds* (414 BC).

In the *Birds*, two Athenian citizens, Pisthetaerus and Euelpides, have left Athens in order to build a town between heaven and earth, Νεφέλοκοκκυγία. Having arrived in Cloudcuckooland they meet the Hoopoe, formerly a man, namely Tereus, with whom Aristophanes presents an animal as soloist. The Athenians meet the Hoopoe in front of his nest and explain their plan to him. Interested, the Hoopoe promises to wake up his mate, the nightingale, who is sleeping in the thicket, in order to summon together all the birds for a counsel (203-5). After entering the stage building he appears on the roof singing an anapaestic prelude (209-18), a ὕμνος κλητικός accompanied by the aulos-player.

2 The Hoopoe's Monody

After the anapaestic prelude, a stage direction (παρεπιγραφή) indicates by αὐλεῖ a solo of the aulos-player, replacing the voice of the nightingale, which is enthusiastically welcomed by the Athenians. Then they notice that the Hoopoe is preparing a new song, an extended monody (227-62), which can be found together with the related metrical analysis in Appendix 1. From this analysis it becomes evident that the monody of the Hoopoe is a perfect example of the *astrophē* which are familiar in Euripides' monodies and the parodies of them by Aristophanes. There is no alternation of strophes and antistrophes as usual in choral lyrics. Instead we find a series of paragraphs of different lengths, which are defined by the content, by changes of the metre and probably of the music. Often these sections are marked off by lines *extra metrum*.

¹ See Trendall-Webster 1972.

Looking on Appendix 1, this structure catches the eye. In the Hoopoe's *monody* there are five such sections: 230-37 summons the birds of the fields, marked off by a bird's cry (237: $\tau\iota\omicron \tau\iota\omicron \tau\iota\omicron \tau\iota\omicron \tau\iota\omicron \tau\iota\omicron \tau\iota\omicron$). 238-42 calls the birds of the gardens and the mountains, again marked off by a bird's cry (242: $\tau\rho\iota\omicron\tau\omicron \tau\rho\iota\omicron\tau\omicron \tau\omicron\tau\omicron\beta\rho\iota\zeta$). 244-48 addresses the birds of the marshland, marked off by the repeated name of the francolin (249: $\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma. \acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$). The last section (250-54) summons the birds of the sea. It is marked off by a paroemiacus (254: $\omicron\iota\omega\nu\omega\nu \tau\alpha\nu\alpha\omicron\delta\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu$). These groups may fall into subgroups (e.g. 234). There are lines *extra metrum* (242, 260, 262). Finally the Hoopoe explains his aims (255-59), and the passage ends with three lines of birds' cries (260-62).

The aforesaid monody is not only astrophic, but also polymetric, as can be seen again in Appendix 1. The various paragraphs are distinguished metrically by conspicuous beginnings (dochmiacs, ionics, cretics, dactyls, anapaests). The transitions ($\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota$) from one metre to the next are managed very smoothly. Leaving aside the metrically dubious birds' cries, we see in Appendix 1 that the first section, concerning the birds of the fields, is introduced by bulky dochmiacs (230: $\delta\sigma\omicron\iota \tau' \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\gamma\rho\omicron\iota\kappa\omega\nu \gamma\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\varsigma$). There follow changing cola, iambic, dactylic, trochaic and again dochmiac. The next section, concerning the birds of the gardens and the mountains, is introduced by resounding ionics (238: $\delta\sigma\alpha \theta' \upsilon\mu\omega\nu \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \kappa\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon$). There follow chains of shorts with different metrical meaning. The third section, concerning the birds of the marshland, is opened by cretics, which dominate the whole section (244: $\omicron\iota \theta' \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma \pi\alpha\rho' \alpha\upsilon\lambda\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma \delta\zeta\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{o}\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$). Interspersed is one glyconeus, which ends with a cretic. The fourth section, concerning the birds of the sea, has four cola of rolling dactyls, beginning with 250: $\omicron\nu \tau' \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \pi\acute{o}\nu\tau\iota\omicron\nu \omicron\iota\delta\mu\alpha \theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$, and rounded off by a paroemiacus (254). In the fifth section the Hoopoe announces a wise man from the earth, Pisthetaerus, by a remarkable series of long syllables, contracted anapaests, beginning with 255: $\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \tau\iota\varsigma \delta\rho\iota\mu\acute{\nu}\varsigma \pi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\upsilon\varsigma$. Then he calls the birds together by two trochaic metra, ending with 259: $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\rho\omicron \delta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\rho\omicron \delta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\rho\omicron \delta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\rho\omicron$. The monody is closed with three lines of birds' cries, of which the middle line can be scanned by cretics (261: $\kappa\iota\kappa\alpha\beta\alpha\upsilon \kappa\iota\kappa\alpha\beta\alpha\upsilon$). It is obvious that the monody of the Hoopoe is a masterly counterfeit of the late astrophic and polymetric monodies of Euripides, which are also the target of some parodic monodies of Aristophanes in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Frogs*.²

2 See Pöhlmann 2009c, 259-71.

3 Astrophic and Polymetric Monodies in Euripides

Euripides embellished his tragedies with strophic monodies from the beginning. In the *Alcestis* (438 BC) Eumelus, child of Alcestis, sings the strophe (393-403) and antistrophe (406-15) of a lament for the death of his mother, separated by two trimeters of Admetus. In the *Andromache* (429 BC) an unique monody appears at the beginning: in seven elegiac distichs in Doric vocalisation Andromache laments the fall of Troy and her miserable life in Thessalia (103-16). Later, Peleus sings the strophe (1173-83) and antistrophe (1186-96) of a lament of the death of Neoptolemus, separated by two trimeters of the chorus. In the *Electra* (ca 418 BC) Electra laments the death of Agamemnon and her wretched fate, singing two pairs of strophe and antistrophe (112-24=127-39; 140-49=157-66), separated in each case by a link sung by herself. And in the *Troades* (415 BC) Cassandra sings a strophic hymenaeus (308-24=325-40), which sounds like a dreadful parody of a wedding song. It is obvious that Euripides experimented already with the traditional strophic form.

But in 428 BC in a monody in the *Hippolytus* (1370-88), which can found in Appendix 2 together with a metrical analysis, Euripides shook off the straitjacket of strophic form altogether, obviously animated by the astrophic form of the New Dithyramb, as we shall see. The fatally wounded Hippolytus begins with spoken anapaests, which address the chorus (1347-69). Then he sings a monody: it begins with a prelude in sung anapaests (1370-77) introduced by two cries of pain *extra metrum* (1370 αἰαῖ αἰαῖ) and distinguished as lyric by Doric vocalisation (1371 ὀδυνά μ' ὀδυνά).

After the anapaestic prelude, there follows an astrophic polymetric section, which is clearly structured into two sections of different length (1378-83; 1384-88). The first section begins after a smooth transition by anapaests (1378: ὦ πατρός ἐμοῦ δύστανος ἀρά.), with iambic and baccheic cola, then an anapaest followed by two iambic dimeters (1382 f.: τὸν οὐδὲν ὄντ' ἐπαίτιον κακῶν;). Cries of pain *extra metrum* (1384: ἰὼ μοί μοί), which can be understood as a syncopated dochmiac, separate the two sections. The second section is opened by two bacchei (1385: τί φῶ; πῶς ἀπαλλάξω); then come aeolic cola, dodrans and lecythion. The section is rounded off by iambic metra and their choriambic, cretic and baccheic variants (1388 f.: μέλαι-/να νύκτερός τ' ἀνάγκη). Two iambic trimeters spoken by Aphrodite (1389-90) frame the monody of Hippolytus.

Similar structures appear in *Hecuba* (425 BC). In 1056-1106, Polymestor, who had been blinded by the imprisoned Trojan women, sings a monody which informs the spectator about the incidents in Hecuba's tent, where Polymestor's children had been killed. The external and metrical structure of the monody is again well in keeping with the content. Two years after the production of the

Birds of Aristophanes (414 BC) this type of astrophic and polymetric monody is repeated by Euripides in the *Helen* (412 BC); then in the *Phoenissae* (411-408 BC), the *Orestes* (408 BC) and the *Iphigenia in Aulis* (406 BC). It is obvious that in his late tragedies from 428 BC to 406 BC Euripides adopted the style and the structure of the New Dithyramb with his astrophic and polymetric monodies. Only a small subgroup, the *Troades* (415 BC), the *Iphigenia in Tauris* (412-410) and the *Ion* (412-408), limits the monody to lyric anapaests.³

4 Astrophic and Polymetric Monodies in the New Dithyramb

Euripides, as we have seen, abandoned the inherited strophic structure of the monody as early as 428 BC for the benefit of more possibilities of expression (μίμησις). The same leap with the same background happened in the dithyramb, which also had in its beginnings strophic structure, as the Pseudoaristotelian *Problems* (19.15) attest: οἱ διθύραμβοι, ἐπειδὴ μιμητικοὶ ἐγένοντο, οὐκέτι ἔχουσιν ἀντιστροφούς, πρότερον δὲ εἶχον ("When the dithyramb became imitative, it dismissed the antistrophes, which it formerly had"). Aristotle (*Rh.* 1409b25) connects this leap with the notorious musical modernist Melanippides, who is said to have replaced the strophic structure by *anabolai*: ποιήσαντα ἀντὶ τῶν ἀντιστροφῶν ἀναβολάς.

Melanippides and the New Dithyramb might have been influenced by another genre, the *nomos kitharodikos*, for which we have an extended example in the *Persians* of Timotheus (about 450-360 BC), which was also astrophic and polymetric. Timotheus wrote in both genres.⁴ But there is no reason to think that he gave his dithyrambes the inherited strophic structure. The astrophic and polymetric style was common in the latter part of the 5th century BC in many genres.⁵

The isolated remark of Aristotle cited above accompanies a quotation of Democritus of Chios attacking Melanippides.⁶ It leaves some doubt as to what Aristotle denotes with ἀντιστρόφοι and ἀναβολαί. The remark is found at the end of a paragraph (1409b27) about the continuous style (λέξις εἰρομένη) as opposed to the periodic style (λέξις κατεστραμμένη), the beginning of which makes unmistakably clear what Aristotle means (1409a24-36).

3 See Pöhlmann 2009b.

4 Hordern 2002, 17-25; 25-33; 81-98 and commentary.

5 See West 1982; Hordern 2002, 55-60.

6 See Schmid 1946, 4, 124,4; 133,7; 480,4.

The continuous style is compared with the ἀναβολαί of the dithyramb, as the respective parts come to an end not by themselves, but only with the content. The periodic style however is compared with the ἀντίστροφοι of the old poets, as the respective parts have their end in themselves: τὴν δὲ λέξιν ἀνάγκη εἶναι ἢ εἰρομένην ... ὥσπερ αἱ ἐν τοῖς διθυράμβοις ἀναβολαί, ἢ κατεστραμμένην καὶ ὁμοίαν ταῖς τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν ἀντιστρόφοις (“the style must be either continuous like the *anabolai* in the dithyramb, or periodic, like the antistrophes of the old poets”). Λέγω δὲ εἰρομένην ἢ οὐδὲν ἔχει τέλος καθ’ αὐτήν, ἂν μὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα <τὸ> λεγόμενον τελειωθῇ ... λέγω δὲ περίοδον λέξιν ἔχουσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ τελευτὴν αὐτὴν καθ’ αὐτήν (“I call the style continuous which has no end in itself, if not the content itself comes to an end ... I call the style periodic which has beginning and end in itself”).

It is obvious that ἀντιστρόφοι in the *Rhetoric* denotes the antistrophic style generally, namely the pair of strophe and antistrophe together, and not the antistrophe alone. Consequently the ἀναβολαί of Melanippides denote the complete texts of the New Dithyramb, and not only instrumental interludes, as one might think. Unfortunately there are no extended fragments of Melanippides. But we can use in his place the dithyrambic ἀναβολαί which Aristophanes in the *Birds* assigns to the dithyrambic poet Cinesias, who had come to Cloudcuckooland in order to become a bird.

5 The ἀναβολαί of Cinesias in *Birds* 1372-1400

Birds 1372-1400, the ἀναβολαί of Cinesias, appears in Appendix 3 together with a metrical analysis. These ἀναβολαί exemplify again the astrophic and polymetric style, which we know already from the monodies of the Hoopoe and of Hippolytus. This brilliant parody of the ἀναβολαί of Cinesias by Aristophanes can be read as the poetics of the New Dithyramb. In Appendix 3 there are printed only the fragments of the sung ἀναβολαί of Cinesias, whereas the intervening lines of dialogue are omitted. Thus it is easy to see that the ἀναβολαί of Cinesias are astrophic and polymetric, and display a clear structure. Moreover, it transpires that we have two different ἀναβολαί. The first ἀναβολή (1372-81) is marked by the ionic and its syncopated form (1374: πέτομαι δ’ ὁδὸν ἄλλοτ’ ἐπ’ ἄλλαν μελέων), which comes in after an introduction in ionics and their choriambic and baccheic variants. The second ἀναβολή (1393-1400) begins with an aeolic colon (reiz) and a iambic metron. There follows a paroemiacus, and after an interjection *extra metrum* an iambic dimeter and again an aeolic colon (ith). The section is rounded off by rolling anapaests depicting the flight of

Cinesias in the ether (1398-1400: τοτὲ μὲν νοτίαν στείχων πρὸς ὁδὸν / τοτὲ δ' αὖ βορέα σῶμα πελάζων / ἀλίμενον αἰθέρος αὔλακα τέμνων).

6 Conclusion

Aristophanes, as we have seen, has accomplished with the astrophic and polymetric monody of the Hoopoe in the *Birds* a brilliant counterfeit of the astrophic and polymetric monodies of late Euripides. This counterfeit is devoid of any element of polemic, which we find in other parodies of Euripides' monodies in the *Thesmophoriazusae* and the *Frogs*. In the *Birds* however, Aristophanes displays some sympathy with Euripides and his modernism, a sympathy for which Cratinus coined the happy expression εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζειν (342 PCG). Bernhard Zimmermann has pointed to the fact that Aristophanes in the *Birds* offers παρατραγῳδία, not παρωδία.⁷ Even the scapegoat of the New Dithyramb, the windy Cinesias and his ἀναβολαί, is treated in the *Birds* with some negligence as a figure of fun. Plato, however, had attacked the promoters of the New Mimetic Music because of musical extravagances like the imitation of birds' sounds (*R.* 397a: ὥστε πάντα ἐπιχειρήσει μιμεῖσθαι ... πάντων ὀργάνων φωνάς, καὶ ἔτι κυνῶν καὶ προβάτων καὶ ὀρνέων φωνάς). But in the *Birds* of Aristophanes the singing animals are only the pretext for a musical *tour de force*, the aim of which is nothing but the delight of connoisseurs.

Bibliography

- Barret, W.F. 1964. *Euripides' Hippolytus*, ed. with introduction and commentary (Oxford).
- Dale, A.M. 1968². *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (Cambridge).
- Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes Birds*, ed. with introduction and commentary (Oxford).
- Hordern, J.H. 2002. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*, ed. with introduction and commentary (Oxford).
- Pöhlmann, E. 2009a. *Gegenwärtige Vergangenheit* (Berlin/New York).
- Pöhlmann, E. 2009b. *Ancient Greek Poetry and the Development of Monody*, in: Pöhlmann 2009a, 245-57.
- Pöhlmann, E. 2009c. *Aristophanes, Free Form and the Monody*, in: Pöhlmann 2009a, 258-83.

⁷ Zimmermann 1984, 71 f.; 77-81.

Rau, P. 1967. *Paratragodia. Untersuchungen zu einer komischen Form des Aristophanes* (München).

Schmid, W. 1946. *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur I 4* (München).

Trendall, A.D., Webster, T.B.L. 1972. *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London).

West, M.L. 1982. *Metrical Analyses: Timotheos and Others*, ZPE 45, 1-13.

Zimmermann, B. 1984-87. *Untersuchungen zur Form und dramatischen Technik der aris-
tophanischen Komödie. Bd. I* (1984), *Parodos und Amoibaion*; *Bd. II* (1985), *Die anderen
lyrischen Partien*; *Bd. III* (1987), *Metrische Analysen* (Königstein und Frankfurt).

Appendix 1

The Monody of the Hoopoe, Aristophanes' *Birds* 227-62

Metrical analysis according to Dunbar 1995, 211 f.

Hoopoe: Bird's cries

227	ἐποποποῖ ποποποποῖ ποποῖ,	υ υ υ - υ υ υ - υ -	cr do
228	ἰὼ ἰὼ ἰτῶ ἰτῶ ἰτῶ ἰτῶ	υ - υ - υ - υ - υ - υ -	3ia
229	ἴτω τις ὦδε τῶν ἐμῶν ὁμοπτέρων	υ - υ - υ - υ - υ - υ -	3ia

Birds of the fields

230	ὅσοι τ' εὐσπόρους ἀγροίκων γυῖας	υ - - υ - υ - - υ -	2do
231	νέμεσθε, φύλα μυρία κριθοτράγων	υ - υ - υ - υ υ - υ υ -	iambelegus
232	σπερμολόγων τε γένη	- υ υ - υ υ -	hemiepes
233	ταχὺ πετόμενα, μαλθακὴν ἰέντα γῆρυν	υ υ υ υ υ - υ - υ - υ υ	3tr
234	ὅσα τ' ἐν ἄλοκι θαμὰ	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ	do
235	βῶλον ἀμφιτιττυβίζεθ' ὦδε λεπτὸν	- υ - υ - υ - υ - υ - υ -	3tro
236	ἡδομένα φωνᾷ	- υ υ - - -	do
237	τιο τιο τιο τιο τιο τιο τιο τιο	- υ - υ - υ - υ - υ - υ - υ υ	4tr

Birds of the gardens and the mountains

238	ὅσα θ' ὑμῶν κατὰ κήπους ἐπὶ κισσοῦ	υ υ - - υ υ - - υ υ - -	3io
239	κλάδεσι νομὸν ἔχει,	υ υ υ υ υ υ -	do
240	τά τε κατ' ὄρεα τὰ κοτινοτράγα τὰ κομαροφάγα	υυυ υυυ υυυ υυυ υυυ υυυ	3tr
241	ἀνύσατε πετόμενα πρὸς ἐμὰν αὐδάν·	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ - - -	2an
242	τριοτὸ τριοτὸ-τοτοβρίζ	υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ -	extra metrum

Birds of the marshland

244	οἳ θ' ἐλείας παρ' αὐλῶνας ὀξυστόμους	- υ - - υ - - υ - - υ -	4cr
245	ἐμπίδας κάπτεθ', ὅσα τ' εὐδρόσους γῆς τόπους	- υ - - υ υ υ - υ - - υ -	4cr
246f	ἔχετε λειμῶνά τ' ἐρόεντα Μαραθῶνος	υ υ υ - υ υ υ - υ υ υ - - Λ	3cr sp
248	ὄρνις τε πετροποίκιλος	- - - υ υ - υ -	gly
249	ἄτταγάς ἄτταγάς·	- υ - - υ -	2cr

Birds of the sea

250	ὦν τ' ἐπὶ πόντιον οἶδμα θαλάσσης	- υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - -	4da
251	φύλα μετ' ἀλκυόνεσσι ποτῆται·	- υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - -	4da
252	δεῦρ' ἴτε πευσόμενοι τὰ νεώτερα·	- υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ	4da
253	πάντα γὰρ ἐνθάδε φύλ' ἀθροίζομεν	- υ υ - υ υ - υ υ - υ υ	4da
254	οἰωνῶν ταναοδείρων.	- - - - υ υ - - Λ	par

Athenians are announced

255	ἦκει γὰρ τις δριμὺς πρέσβυς	- - - - -	2an
256	καινὸς γνῶμην	- - - -	an
257	καινῶν ἔργων τ' ἐγχειρητῆς	- - - - -	2an
258	ἀλλ' ἴτ' εἰς λόγους ἅπαντα,	- υ - υ - υ - υ	2tr
259	δεῦρο δεῦρο δεῦρο δεῦρο	- υ - υ - υ - υ	2tr

Hoopoe: Bird's cries

260	τορο τορο τορο τοροτίξ	υυυυ υυυυ - Λ	extra metrum
261	κικαβαῦ κικαβαῦ	- υ - - υ -	2cr
262	τορο τορο τορο τορο λιλιλιξ.	υυυυ υυυυ υυ -	extra metrum

Metrical signs:

	verse end
	stanza end
Λ	catalexis or syncopation

Appendix 2

The Monody of Hippolytus in Euripides *Hippolytus* 1347-90

Metrical analysis according to Barrett 1964, 405

Hippolytus 1347-69 (spoken anapaests)

1347	αἰαῖ αἰαῖ	1359	χροὸς ἐλκῶδους ἄπτεσθε χεροῖν.
1348	δύστηνος ἐγώ, πατρός ἐξ ἀδίκου	1360	τίς ἐφέστηκεν δεξιά πλευροῖς;
1349	χρησμοῖς ἀδικοῖς διελυμάνθην.	1361	πρόσφορά μ' αἶρετε, σύντονα δ' ἔλκετε
1350	Ἀπόλωλα τάλας, οἴμοι μοι.	1362	τὸν κακοδαίμονα καὶ κατάρατον
1351	διὰ μου κεφαλῆς ἄσσουσ' ὀδύναι,	1363	πατρός ἀμπλακίαις. Ζεῦ Ζεῦ, τάδ' ὀρᾷς:
1352	κατὰ δ' ἐγκέφαλον πηδᾷ σφάκελος.	1364	ὅδ' ὁ σεμνὸς ἐγώ καὶ θεοσέπτωρ,
1353	Σχές, ἀπειρηκὸς σώμ' ἀναπαύσω.	1365	ὅδ' ὁ σωφροσύνη πάντας ὑπερσχών
1354	ἔ ἔ	1366	προϋπτον ἐς Ἄϊδην στεῖχω, κατ' ἄκρας
1355.	ὦ στυγνὸν ὄχημ' ἵππειον, ἐμῆς	1367	ὀλέσας βίον,· μόχθους δ' ἄλλως
1356	βόσκημα χερός,	1368	τῆς εὐσεβίας
1357	διὰ μ' ἐφθειρας, κατὰ δ' ἔκτεινας	1369	εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπόνησα.
1358	φεῦ φεῦ· πρὸς θεῶν, ἀτρέμα, δμῶες,		

Hippolytus 1370-77 (sung anapaests)

1370	αἰαῖ αἰαῖ·	---	an
1371	καὶ νῦν ὀδύνα μ' ὀδύνα βαίνει,	--υυ-υυ---	an dim
1372	μέθετέ με, τάλανα	υυυυυυ	an Λ
1373	καὶ μοι θάνατος Παιδᾶν ἔλθοι	--υυ-----	an dim
1374	προσαπόλλυτ' ἀπόλλυτε τὸν δυσδαί-	υυ-υυ-υυ---	an dim
1375	μονά <μ>. ἀμφιτόμου λόγχας ἔραμαι,	υυ-υυ---υυ-	an dim
1376	διαμοιρᾶσαι κατὰ τ' εὐνάσαι	υυ---υυ---	an dim
1377	τὸν ἐμὸν βίον.	υυ-υυ-	an

Hippolytus 1378-88 (polymetric monody)

1378	ὦ πατρός ἐμοῦ δύστανος ἀρά·	--υυ---υυ-	an dim
1379	μιαφόνον τι σύγγονον	υ-υ-υ-υ-	2 ia
1380	παλαιῶν προγεννη-	υ--υ--	2 ba
	τόρων ἐξορίζεται	υ--υ-υ-	ba ia
1381	κακὸν οὐδὲ μένει	υυ-υυ-	an
1382	ἔμολε τ' ἐπ' ἐμέ—τί ποτε τὸν οὐ-	υυυυυυυυυυ-	ia dim
1383	δὲν ὄντ' ἐπαίτιον κακῶν;	υ-υ-υ-υ-	ia dim
1384	ἰώ μοί μοι·	υ---	extra metrum
1385	τί φῶ; πῶς ἀπαλλά-	υ--υ--	2 ba
	ξω βιοτὰν ἐμὰν	-υυ-υ-	dodrans

1386	τοῦδ' ἀνάλγητον πάθους;	- υ - - - υ -	lec
1387	εἶθε με κοιμάσσειε τὸν	- υ υ - - - υ -	cho ia
1388	δυσδαίμον' Ἄιδου μέλαι-	- - υ - - υ -	ia cr
	να νύκτερός τ' ἀνάγκα.	υ - υ - υ - -	ia ba

Artemis (ia.trim)

1389	ὦ τλήμον, οἷα συμφορὰ συνεζύγης·
1390	τό δ' εὐγενές σε τῶν φρενῶν ἀπώλεσεν.

Appendix 3

The *Anabolai* of Cinesias in Aristophanes' *Birds* 1373-1409

Metrical analysis according to Dunbar 1995, 661 f.

Anabole 1 (1372-81)

Cinesias

1372	ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμ-	υ υ υ υ - - υ υ -	io cho
1373	πον πτερύγεσσι κούφαις	- υ υ - υ - -	cho ba
1374	πέτομαι δ' ὁδὸν ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλαν μελέων	υ υ - Λ υ υ - Λ υ υ - - υ υ - Λ	zioΛ io ioΛ

Peisetairos

1375	ia.trim
------	---------

Cinesias

1376	ἀφόβῳ φρενὶ σώματί	υ υ - Λ υ υ - υ υ	ioΛ io
1377	τε νέαν ἐφέπων	υ υ - Λ υ υ - Λ	zioΛ

Peisetairos

1378-79	2 ia.trim
---------	-----------

Cinesias

1380	ὄρνις γενέσθαι βούλομαι	- - υ - - - υ -	zia
1381	λιγύφθογγος ἀηδῶν	Λ υ - - υ υ - -	Λio io

Peisetairos and Cinesias

1382-1392	11 ia.trim
-----------	------------

*Anabole 2 (1393-1400)***Cinesias**

1393	εἶδωλα πετηνῶν αἰθεροδρόμων	-- υ υ --- υ υ υ -	reiz ia
1394	οἰωνῶν ταναοδείρων	---- υ υ -- Λ	2anΛ (par)

Peisetairos

1395a	ὦ ὅπ	- υ	extra metrum
-------	------	-----	--------------

Cinesias

1395b	ἀλίδρομον ἀλάμενος ἄμ' ἀνέ-	- υ υ υ - υ υ υ υ υ υ	2ia
1396	μων πνοαῖσι βαίην	- υ - υ --	ith

Peisetairos

1397	ia.trim		
------	---------	--	--

Cinesias

1398	τοτὲ μὲν νοτίαν στείχων πρὸς ὁδόν	υ υ - υ υ --- υ υ -	2an
1399	τοτὲ δ' αὖ βορέα σῶμα πελάζων	υ υ - υ υ -- υ υ --	2an
1400	ἀλίμενον αἰθέρος αὐλακα τέμνων.	υ υ υ υ - υ υ - υ υ --	2an

The κύκνειον ᾠσμα

An Approach to Its Musical Contents

Luis Calero

Universidad Rey Juan Carlos (Madrid, Spain)

luis.calero@urjc.es

Abstract

In Greek Literature the characteristics of swans are used as a metaphor for a variety of human values. Their colour, their bravery and their singing are the three main characteristics we usually find in Greek texts as synonyms for beauty, courage and musical dexterity. In this paper, I try to go a step further, to explore whether it is possible to discover how ancient writers imagined the κύκνειον ᾠσμα might have sounded. I analyse the type of sound the relevant texts represent as their singing and even the use of their bodies as instruments in certain texts. I then show how ancient writers illustrated the swan song, the κύκνειον ᾠσμα, in musical contexts beyond the image of swans as animals capable of singing their dirge of death.

Keywords

swan-song – music – heptatony – dirge of death

Chantraine (1968, s.v.) and Beekes & Van Beek (2010, s.v.) affirm that the Greek word for 'swan', κύκνος, seems related to Skt. *śócati*, 'to lighten, glow', and *śukrá-*, 'light, clear, white', and that its possible onomatopoeic origin must be avoided, as other researchers suggest. Its root is, therefore, reconstructed as **(s)keuk-*, although formerly it was thought of as **keuk-* (cf. Beekes & Van Beek 2010, s.v.). As far as we know, there is no evidence of the word in Mycenaean (Aura Jorro 1985). In Greek, it is used to name the animal, as well as a ship, because of the shape of its figurehead (Nicostr.Com.fr. 10.1-3), and, presumably because of its colour, an eye-salve (Gal. *De compositione medicamentorum* 12.708.2). Κύκνος is also the name of at least five heroes in the post-Homeric tradition (Grimal

1986, s.v.). Derivatives from it are the adjective κύκνειος, commonly found in literature, the medical diminutive κυκνάριον,¹ κυκνίας,² and its compound forms are κυκνοκάνθαρος (Ath. 11.474b, quoting Nicostr. Com. fr. 10.3), κυκνόπτερος (Eur. Or. 1386) and κυκνόμορφος ([Aesch.] Pr. 795). Both κύκνος and κύκνειος survive in modern Greek.

Swans are a type of bird that appears constantly in iconographic and textual contexts since the very beginning of Greek culture. They can be seen in vases, frescoes, statuettes, and so on, represented in a variety of situations. Neolithic examples of birds in Greece are not very frequent. Extant examples are clay heads of birds usually attached to vessels from the Early or the Middle Neolithic periods.³ Later, and even though Minoans were extremely keen on depicting birds in their palaces and daily objects, we never find examples of swans employed as a bird to decorate walls or vases (Masseti 1997). Mycenaean art depicts examples of long-necked birds in pottery and in jewellery, but it is not easy to determine whether they represent swans or other birds, like geese and cranes. However, what can be perfectly recognized as swan-like types are the Minoan and Mycenaean swan-neck lyres we find as far back as 2200-2000 BCE (tomb of Spedos, in the Aegean island of Keros) or the Hagia Triada (around 1500 BCE) and Pylos (around 1300 BCE) examples, that have been studied by Vorreiter (1975). One of the oldest figurines that survived is an Athenian terracotta, dated around 700-650 BCE, that can be seen at the Staatliche Antikensammlungen of München (inv. Sch 120), in which four adult swans (geese according to some scholars, although this detail is of no importance for our study) hold one cygnet each on their backs, while three siblings swim behind them and another seven precede the whole group.⁴

In the Homeric poems, references to swans can be found just twice. They appear cited at *Il.* 2.460 and 15.692 among other birds, the long-necked geese and cranes, in the clearly formulaic verse *χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἢ κύκνων δουλιχοδείρων*. In general terms, they illustrate natural, ritual, symbolic, and religious scenes of a great variety. It is quite common to use these animals in different contexts, but tradition has usually associated them with death scenarios, as I shall discuss below, for it was thought they sing when they are about to die. Because

1 [Gal.] *Introductio seu medicus* 14.765.18; Aët. *Latricorum* 7.8.16, 7.9.24, 7.11.6, 7.17.17, 7.106.1, 7.106.68, 7.106.76, 7.112.52, 7.114.22, 11.29.68; Paul. Aeg. 3.22.12.7, 7.16.8.1.

2 Meaning a white eagle in Paus. 8.17.3-5.

3 Some examples can be seen in Toufexis 2003, 267.

4 I want to kindly thank Dr. Astrid Fendt, Konservatorin at the München Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, for her help in finding the inventory number of this piece for me.

of this characteristic, already observed by the Greeks, they repeatedly appear in musical descriptions, mainly in textual examples, or symbolize musical elements in an iconographic context, either positive or negative.

I intend to isolate the musical attributes of swans that can be traced in texts,⁵ but before doing so, it is convenient to understand what underlies the idea of swans as singing animals. There are several species of swans in the animal kingdom and, contrary to what one might think, not all of them sing. If we concentrate our study in Greece, we need to focus our analysis on just two of them: the *cygnus olor*, commonly known as the mute swan, and the *cygnus cygnus*, or whooper swan. As Arnott (1977) points out, the wild-mute type can be found nowadays in eastern Thrace, but is well documented as far as Attica and Euboea until the beginning of the twentieth century, when lakes and marshes were dried out in the country. However, it is a common winter visitor to other parts of Greece, whereas the whooper species is an infrequent passing migrant that can be seen on Hellenic soil during the winter. As swans were tamed for the first time in tenth-century Britain, though the Romans had tried it before, it is important to keep in mind that this bird was entirely wild in ancient Greece. Therefore, the Greeks based their literary representation of this animal on mere observation of both species with some obvious misunderstandings. Furthermore, the mute swan was less easily seen in ancient times than nowadays and was not so well known to ancient writers. For instance, Euripides tells us about their bright red feet (*Ion*. 163 φοινικοφαῖ πόδα), when in fact they are brownish black.⁶ Ancient writers were not aware of or did not care about the distinctions between the two species of swans. They were only interested in how this type of bird could serve their literary needs.

Before turning to an analysis of the literary characteristics of music and swans in the ancient Greek world, we must consider a biological review of these two varieties of the animal so that textual references to them may be contextualized. Both types of swans present obvious structural differences one can observe at first sight. The first thing that attracts our attention is the variances of coloration and shape in their bills. The mute swan (*cygnus olor*) has a roundish pale orange bill with a black protuberance close to its eyes, whereas the whooper's (*cygnus cygnus*) is yellowish towards the middle section, where it becomes dark black, and clearly flatter and less regular than the former's. They also hold their neck in a different way while they swim, so that the cant of

5 Castrucci (2014) isolates several examples of the Delian swans according to the literary evolution of the *threnos* towards the *paian*.

6 For a further study on this detail, see Harris 2012b.

the mute swan looks a bit more upright than that of the whooper, which makes it rest on the upper section of its back.

There is a third distinction between the two of them, which is quite important for our study and is reflected in their common names: while the whooper swan makes sounds, the mute type is expected to be a silent bird. However, during their breeding season, the mute swans use a repertoire of hisses and snorts, which are much louder in the wild animals than in the tame ones. They can be heard, then, *singing* a single, loud high-pitched note. Also, when they fly, their wing-beats produce a powerful throb that can be easily heard from afar and that could even emit an array of different pitch sounds if heard live due to the Doppler effect.⁷ On the other hand, the whooper swan produces a characteristic two-note bugle-like sound, both in the air and on land, in what may remind us of a melody whose second part is a note higher than the first one, which is repeated once and again. Furthermore, the wings of this second species only produce the mute long swish we are commonly used to in many large birds. It is obvious that ancient writers mixed up the two types, along with their distinctive sounds from trachea and wing-beats, without concern for accuracy and simply for literary purposes. By the way, it is interesting to note that Claudius Aelianus (*VH* 1.14.7f.) affirms that he never heard a swan singing and that he thinks no one ever has done!

Whatever their appreciations of the real bird sounds might have been, the swan song, the κύκνειον ᾠσμα, was a literary figure in which death is present since the beginning of Greek literature.⁸ Although most of the time it was believed that the swan's own death made it start singing, sometimes it can be read in different ways. Aesop, for instance, who advances the idea of their singing before dying in *Fab.* 247.1.1 (τοὺς κύκνους φασὶ παρὰ τὸν θάνατον ᾄδειν), presents two examples in which its singing in the dark helps the animal avoid death, after its owner mistakes the swan for the goose he wants to slaughter. He is the only author that uses the idea of the animal singing in order to survive. These two texts are quite similar to each other. Most of the information they contain looks like a variation of the same source. They are⁹ *Fab.* 277.1.5-7 (ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἀντὶ τοῦ χηνὸς ἀπαχθεὶς ᾄδει μέλος θανάτου προοίμιον· καὶ τῇ μὲν ὥδῃ μὴνύει τὴν

7 This idea was pointed out to me by Timothy J. Moore at the MOISA conference in Athens, July 2016. I want to express my gratitude to him for such an interesting detail on the matter that had completely skipped my mind.

8 And Roman too. An interesting review of both Greek and Roman main literary quotations on this expression can be found in Tosi 2000, s.v.

9 The translation of both texts, with slight differences that do not alter the purpose of this paper, would be 'the swan, mistaken for the goose, sings the *prooimion* melody of death, and

φύσιν τὴν δὲ τελευτὴν διαφεύγει τῷ μέλει) and *Fab. Aphth.* 2.7-9 (ὁ κύκνος δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ χηνὸς ἀπαχθεὶς ὥδῃ σημαίνει τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν τελευτὴν διαφεύγει τῷ μέλει). The swan song does not necessarily always imply a sad or mournful type of singing like a dirge of death. Sometimes, on the contrary, it is also interpreted by writers as a song of beauty for the animal's close encounter with the god in the afterlife. Plato develops this idea in *Phaedo* (84e.3-85b.9), which must be the most famous text about swans, when Socrates explains to Simmias how they sing the 'most intense and beautiful songs' (πλείστα καὶ κάλλιστα ᾄδουσι) as soon as they perceive that they are close to death, and that they sing it blissfully 'as they are going to be reunited with the god they serve' (γεγηθότες ὅτι μέλλουσι παρὰ τὸν θεὸν ἀπιέναι οὐπὲρ εἰσι θεράποντες). The philosopher advances the thesis that humans deceive themselves when they pretend to understand that swans start to sing 'for the fear they feel before death' (διὰ τὸ αὐτῶν δέος τοῦ θανάτου), for 'no bird sings when it is hungry or cold, or when it feels sad' (καὶ οὐ λογίζονται ὅτι οὐδὲν ὄρνεον ᾄδει ὅταν πεινῇ ἢ ῥιγῶ ἢ τινα ἄλλην λύπην λυπῇται), as do the nightingale, the swallow or the hoopoe, playing with the contents of the myth that narrates how Procne, Tereus and Philomela were transformed into birds to sing the loss of Itys. Swans are, in the philosopher's eyes, μαντικοί, 'foreseers', and that qualifies them as capable of guessing what joys will be found in Hades. Therefore, as the animals of Apollo, their singing becomes an expression of the happiness they expect to find once they have abandoned this world. They perceive what great pleasures await them in Hades, and they sing with joy 'even more that day than all their previous life' (ᾄδουσι καὶ τέρπονται ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν διαφερόντως ἢ ἐν τῷ ἔμπροσθεν χρόνῳ). Plato is just one of the multiple examples that can be found scattered in the whole of Greek literature illustrating that the idea of the *swan song* must have been in the consciousness of Greek authors, perhaps as a tradition that came down through the centuries within the popular lore.

But, is there a way to discover the origin of this expression? The mute swan, aside from the sounds it produces during the mating season, as we have seen, does not generate any other sound when it dies. However, as Arnott (1977, 152) explains, the whooper swan's trachea is convoluted inside its breastbone. This anatomical characteristic makes it produce a long wailing, flute-like sound from the expelled air of its collapsing lungs when it dies.

I agree with Harris (2012a) when he asserts that the to-sing-one's-own-swan-song proverb was most probably in use in Greek literary culture from the third century BCE on. Expressed as κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν τὸ κύκνειον ᾄσαντες ('following

in its singing reveals its nature and avoids the end with its song'. Note: these two and all the translations in the article are my own.

the proverb ‘singing the swan song’), it can be found in Polybius (30.4.7.2), Diodorus Siculus (31.5.1.13, 31.5.2a.3), Photius (244.318b.11) and, much later, in Michael Apostolius *Paroemiogr.* (10.18.2). A complete description of the contents of the proverb according to the Greeks can be read in Diogenianus, who defines it in his *Paroemiae* (5.37.1-3) the following way: Κύκνειον ᾠσμα: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐγγὺς θανάτου ὄντων, καὶ τὰ τελευταῖα φθεγγομένων. οἱ κύκνοι γὰρ ἀποθνήσκοντες ᾄδουσι (‘swan song: when being close to death, to sing the last words, for swans sing it when about to die’). And this is what was meant in the common use of the expression.

Nevertheless, Harris (2012a) traces back this sense of the expression as a synonym of the song of death at least to 458 BCE, for Aeschylus, in verses 1444-6 of his *Agamemnon*, has Clytemnestra’s use of the expression to describe the last *threnos* Cassandra sings before dying, once brought to Greece by Agamemnon after the ruin of Troy (τὸν ὕστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόον). It is Aeschylus himself again who explains that it was known to him as a Lybian fable (*Myrmidons fr.* 139.1: ὦδ’ ἐστὶ μύθων τῶν Λιβυστικῶν κλέος), which might have also been known to Aesop before him, as the previous examples demonstrate. So, I must agree with Harris’ proposal of using Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* (458 BCE) as the *terminus ante quem* for its being known in Greek literature, even though the expression must have been part of the Greek tradition much further back in time than we are able to trace it.

Having said all this, is there any way to find out what Greek authors imagined the swan song sounded like? Swans have always been linked to music in Greek literature because of their singing abilities, whatever the context may be, as can be observed in Pausanias’ words ‘the swan has got the glory of music’ (1.30.3.5f.: μουσικῆς δόξα). Writers used the image of the animal singing not only when it was about to die, but also while it was flying across the sea. Thus, Hes. *Sc.* 315-7 (οἳ δὲ κατ’ αὐτὸν / κύκνοι ἀερσιπτόται μεγάλ’ ἥπιον, οἳ ῥά τε πολλοὶ / νήχον ἐπ’ ἄκρον ὕδωρ, ‘high-flying swans shrilled loud caws and in great flocks they swam on the water surface’) or Ath. 9.393d¹⁰ (διαίρουσι δὲ καὶ τὸ πέλαγος ᾄδοντες, ‘and they cross the sea singing’). As for the idea of their singing when about to die, examples can be found aside from the one I have already commented on Plato’s *Phaedo* (84e-85b), in Athenaeus (again 9.393d, as well as 14.616b), Aristotle (*HA* 615b) and Claudius Aelianus (*De natura animalium* 2.32, 5.34).

It is interesting to note that the idea that the swan produces sound both before dying and while flying is a mixture of attributes of both species of the animal: the mute, which can be heard from the distance while beating its wings

10 Apparently, following Aristoteles (*fr.* 7.39.344.5, Ed. Rose).

in the air, and the whooper, which makes a sweet, instrument-like sound when expiring. Precisely because of the latter, it is used to illustrate e.g. the death of Orpheus in Moscus' *Epitaphius Bionis* (14-19), sung in a mournful way, which might have been the main way to be heard for a death-announcing animal:

Στρυμόνιοι μύρεσθε παρ' ὕδασι νύκτιν αἴλινα κύκνοι,
καὶ γοεροῖς στομάτεσσι μελίσδετε πένθιμον ὠδὴν
οἷαν ὑμετέροις ποτὶ χεῖλεσι γῆρυς αἶειδεν.
εἶπατε δ' αὖ κούραις Οἰαγρίσιν, εἶπατε πάσαις
Βιστονίαις Νύμφαισιν, 'ἀπώλετο Δῶριος Ὀρφεύς'.

Swans from the Strymon, cry your dirge by the waters
and sing your mourning song with plaintive mouths
as the voice from your bills used to sing.
Tell the maidens of Oiager and all the
Bistonian Nymphs 'the Dorian Orpheus is dead'.

In general terms, ancient Greek authors agreed that the singing of swans was the most beautiful in the animal kingdom, but few of them used vocabulary in accordance with this opinion. For instance, Aesop. 247.1.2 says it is εὐμελέστατον ζῶον, 'the most melodious animal'. There are three examples in Euripides: of the 'sweet singing swan' (fr. 773.34: μελιβόας κύκνος), of 'shrilling, clear sounding and vibrant sound' (*El.* 151: κύκνος ἀχέτας) and even of a swan described in the same way as professional singers (*IT.* 1104: κύκνος μελωδός).¹¹ All these characteristics put together make this animal the most suitable for the religious and musical context around the god Apollo as seen by ancient Greek authors.

Apollo is the god of the new order in the ancient world. He represents triumph, brightness and everything that can be associated with evolution in art. He is described in *Hymn to Hermes* (496-502) as the receiver of the newly created instrument, the lyre, which he masters from the very first strum of the plectrum. Therefore, it is not surprising to find swans appearing in the *Hymn to Apollo* (21.1-5) associated with an instrument itself (the *phorminx* in this case, bearing in mind that 'lyre' is one of the terms used for the whole family of chordophones), with which the αἰοιδός sings his part:

Φοῖβε σὲ μὲν καὶ κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων λιγ' αἶδει
ὄχθη ἐπιθρόσκων ποταμὸν πάρα δινήεντα
Πηνειόν· σὲ δ' αἰοιδὸς ἔχων φόρμιγγα λίγειαν

11 Cf. Bignardi 2013; Castrucci 2013.

ἡδυεπὴς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰεῖδει.
Καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαίρει ἄναξ, ἴλαμαι δέ σ' αἰοιδῇ.

Phoebus, to you even the swan with his wings shrilly sings
jumping in the shores along the whirling river
Peenion. To you with his shrill *phorminx*
the sweet-voiced *aoidos* sings first and last.
And I also salute you, sovereign, and favour you with my singing.

In this text, we see that the swans are placed on the same level as the professional singers, but, while the singer makes use of the *phorminx*, the instrument along with the *kitharis* usually mentioned in epic, swans use their own wings as an instrument (ὑπὸ πτερύγων) that accompanies their loud and clear (λίγα) singing. I would like to stress these two details.

The expression Greek authors use to refer to the way in which someone uses an instrument for musical accompaniment while singing is usually ὑπό + genitive. Thus, e.g., X. *Symp.* 6.4.1 (ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐλοῦ ὑμῖν διαλέγωμαι 'I shall recite for you accompanied by the *aulos*'), Aelius Aristides 233.16 (ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐλοῦ ἐν χώρᾳ ὀρχουμένων 'dancing in place accompanied by the *aulos*'), Philostr. *VA* 5.21.24 (ἢ τὸν λυπούμενον μὲν κοιμίζεσθαι αὐτῷ τὴν λύπην ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐλοῦ 'or calming the pain of that who grieves with the *aulos*'), or, much later, Joannes Chrysostomus *De paenitentia* 60.706.35 (ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐλοῦ πυρὸς κατατηκόμενος 'melted by fire while using the *aulos*'), among many other examples. Crespo, Conti & Maquieira (2003) show that the not-so-frequently-used modal sense of this preposition with the genitive can be valid in these examples, so that they can be translated with the periphrastic 'under the sound or the rhythm' of whatever instrument appears in the text.

Therefore, it must be understood that the use of ὑπὸ πτερύγων implies the employment of their wings as the instrument with which swans accompany their singing, as occurs in Hes. *Op.* 582-4 referring to other animals (τέττιξ / δεινδρῶ ἐφεζόμενος λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ' αἰοιδῇ / πυκνὸν ὑπὸ πτερύγων 'when the cicada, placed on the tree, spills its shrilling dense singing accompanied by its wings'), an example commented on by the scholiast in *Schol. in Opera et Dies* 582-7.1-6.¹²

12 It must be said that in this last case the anonymous author employs ὑπό + dative (ἄδει δὲ ὑπὸ ταῖς πτέρυξι τρίβων ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὸν ἦχον ἐκπέμπων· οὕτω γὰρ αὐτὸν ἄδειν φασί 'it sings rubbing itself with the wings to produce the sound, for this is how it is said they sing'). The combination of this preposition plus dative usually means agent or intermediary, as it can be in this case. Something different can be understood of ὑπό + accusative, as in κροῦσις

Used in a context along with swans (κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων), it can be found in multiple passages.¹³ This must be understood as the main reason why Dio Chrysostom affirms that swans had their musicality in the wings (*Or.* 33.43.1-3: ἢ καὶ γένος τι πέφηνεν ἀνθρώπων ταῖς ῥίσιν εὐμουσον, ὥσπερ τοὺς κύκνους φασὶ τοῖς πτεροῖς, 'or it may have been that a race of men was revealed musical in their noses, as swans are said to be in their wings'). Furthermore, one must realise after this that, when Pratinas (*Jr.* 3.5 Page) uses the expression ποικιλόπτερος μέλος, he does it in the sense of a 'melody of changeful accompaniment produced by their wings', instead of 'melody of wings of changeful hue', as it appears in the LSJ (s.v.).

It can also be observed that the song swans accompany with their wings is usually referred to as λιγύς or λιγυρός. The use of this adjective is quite common in musical contexts and its function denotes a shrill, loud, clear, piercing type of sound, normally in its positive sense.¹⁴ It can already be found in Homer, being used in passages related to Nestor, where it appears in parallel with ἡδυεπής, 'of sweet words', or ἀγορητής, simply 'speaker';¹⁵ heralds, with the formulaic κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγγοισι κέλευσαν / κελεύων, 'to the heralds of loud voice they ordered / he ordering';¹⁶ sirens, who λιγυρῇ θέλγουσιν ἀοιδῇ 'they enchant with their piercing song'¹⁷ or λιγυρὴν δ' ἔντυνον ἀοιδὴν 'they raised the loud strain';¹⁸ whips used for horses;¹⁹ the *phorminx*, that appears always in the dative at the end of the hexameter, φόρμιγγι λιγείῃ,²⁰ but always in the accusative and in end of a verse as well, φόρμιγγα λίγειαν,²¹ wind and breeze²² or even birds.²³ In all cases, it means a characteristic sound which is appreciated by those listening to it, for it illustrates the contexts for which it is needed. It is also the type of sound that is imagined in the singing of the Muses in the Olympian palaces in Hesiod (*Sc.* 205f.: θεαὶ δ' ἐξήρχον ἀοιδῆς / Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες,

ὑπὸ τὴν ᾠδὴν ([Plut.] *Musica* 1141b and [Arist.] *Prob.* 921a.25), where it clearly expresses position, 'under the singing line' (Crespo, Conti & Maquieira 2003).

13 *H. Hom. Ap.* 21.1, *Alcm.* S2.1 Page, *Terp.* fr. S6.1 Page, *Ion* fr. S316.1 Page and *Ar.* fr. 56.20 Austin.

14 On the use of this adjective referred to swans in Callimachus *Aitia* see Sberna 2015.

15 *Il.* 1.248, 2.246, 4.293 and 19.82; *Od.* 20.274.

16 *Il.* 2.50, 2.442, 9.10, 23.39; *Od.* 2.6.

17 *Od.* 12.44.

18 *Od.* 12.183.

19 *Il.* 11.532.

20 *Il.* 9.186, 18.569.

21 *Od.* 8.67, 8.105, 8.254, 8.261, 8.537, 22.332, 23.133.

22 *Il.* 13.590; *Od.* 3.176, 4.357, 4.567.

23 Birds in general in *Il.* 14.290, or specifically a hawk, in *Il.* 19.350.

λιγὺ μελομένης ἐικυῖαι, ‘some goddesses initiated their singing, / Muses of Pieria, truly highly celebrated’), or the one with which lyric composers portray their images of singers and birds. That is why it usually appears in most Greek literature as a well-tuned and resonant sound that must apply also to swans as the different authors imagined it. Thus, it appears in *schol. Ra.* 93a.3f., where swan songs are ‘happy, sweet and shrill’ (οὐ κατὰ κύκνον δὲ ἢ ἀηδὸνα φθειγγόμεναι τερπνὰ μέλη καὶ γλυκύτατα ἢ λιγυρώτατα); in Lucian, where swans sing their ‘shrill melody’ (*Electrum* 4.1-6.24: οἱ γὰρ κύκνοι πηνίκα ὑμῖν τὸ λιγυρὸν ἐκεῖνο ᾄδουσιν); or much later in Gregory of Nazianzus as the swan that ‘sings out loud its song of destiny’ (*Carmina quae expectant ad alios* 1575.6: κύκνου λιγυροῖο μόρον γοάοντος ἀοιδὴν).

A description of the sound of their wings is not infrequently found in association with the term σύριγμα. The etymology of the lexical family around σύρω is not very clear, especially when the non-Indo-European suffix -ιγγ- comes into it.²⁴ Beekes (2010 s.v.) relates it to σαίρω, ‘to sweep’, according to a common root **tuer-* with the same sense, so that σύρω reflects **tur-e/o-* with analogical **σ-*, and the form σαίρω would indicate **tur-ie/o-* with the regular vocalization of the **r*. If all this information is correct, we must assume σύριγμα might conceal the meaning of an effect similar to the harmonics produced when playing the lyre in a sweeping-of-the-strings way, so that συριγμός must be understood in the sense of ‘whistling’ or ‘hissing’ as a continuous sound.²⁵ Pollux (4.83.1), e.g., uses this word in the sense of the hissing and piercing type of sound produced by a wind instrument (μέρη δ’ αὐλημάτων κρούματα, συρίγματα), and this is how we must understand it in the text of Gregory of Nazianzus, when he employs συρίγματα to describe the way he is going to accompany his exit-of-this-world tune, being as he is an old swan (*Carmina de se ipso* 1333.7-9):

κύκνος ὡς γέρων,
λαλεῖν ἑμαυτῷ τὰ πτερῶν συρίγματα,
οὐ θρήνον, ἀλλ’ ὕμνον τιν’ ἐξιτήριον

24 As in σύριξις, συριγγία, or even applied to pipe-like objects, like windpipes, blood-vessels or fistulae, as in συρίγγομαι, συριγγιάζω, and so on.

25 Michaelides (1978 s.v.) reminds its use contrarily to what we are discussing, i.e. in a negative sense, as can be read in the so called *Excerpta Nicomachi* (6.13 Jan), where σιγμός acquires the sense of the piercing, unpleasant and cacophonous sound the priests use symbolically in their practices (σιγμοῖς τε καὶ ποππυσμοῖς καὶ ἀναρθροῖς καὶ ἀσυμφῶνοις ἤχοις συμβολικῶς ἐπικαλοῦνται).

like an old swan,
I'll sing to myself the *syrigmata* of my wings,
not a lament, but some hymn of exit

Another idea linked to that shrill sound comes from the texts of Democritus, the fifth-century philosopher, for it is from birds that men have learned their singing, as the result of imitation of the abilities of the swans and the night-ingales (fr. 154.1-5: τῶν λιγυρῶν, κύκνου καὶ ἀηδόνος, ἐν ᾧδῇι κατὰ μίμησιν). This sense would take root quite deeply in later Peripatetic thought, as μίμησις becomes the primary means by which men obtain knowledge from nature. These same words can also be read in Plutarch (*Soll. an.* 974a.9f.). This idea remained in the mind of the writers until late antiquity, as can be extracted from the *Anacreontea* (60.5-10), a collection of poems in the style of Anacreon that covers from the first to the sixth century CE, in which swans' melody is vibrant (λιγυρὸν μέλος) and gets a new accompaniment from the sound of the wind (μέλπων / ἀνέμου σύναυλος ἡχήϊ).

Aristophanes plays around with the idea of having swans sing accordingly with the sound of the strings of the lyre. In *An.* 769-83, the author uses τιοτιοτιοτιοτιοτιοτιγξ or τοτοτοτοτοτοτοτοτιγξ to illustrate the plucking of the strings in a musical onomatopoeia. If that was not enough, they also accompany their singing with their wings, as described above, inviting the Muses and the Graces to start a blissful song to honour the god: εἶλε δὲ θάμβος ἄνακτας, Ὀλυμπιάδες δὲ μέλος Χάριτες Μοῦσαι τ' ἐπωλόλυξαν. Note the use of the compound of the verb ὀλολύζω, which means *to cry out loudly*, especially for women. This verb is usually employed to invoke the gods in religious ceremonies.²⁶ It usually appears in the sense of calling or shouting with joy, but sometimes it can be used to express sadness.

Precisely because of the resonant quality with which their sound was depicted, ancient writers used to link it quite frequently to mourning, as I pointed out before. Aristotle (*HA* 615b.4, also later in Aelianus *NA* 10.36.1-12) relates that

26 Beekes (2010) and Chantraine (1968, s.v.) relate it to an onomatopoeic reduplicated formation with the same ending as in ἰύζω, βαῦζω, γογγύζω, κοκκύζω, etc. As an onomatopoeic element, it is normal to find similar examples in other languages as likely roots or parallel creations. Thus, they are in clear connection with Lat. *ululare*, 'to howl', *ulula*, 'the owl', Skt. *ululí*, 'crying loudly', and *uluka*, 'the owl', and Lith. *ulula*, 'the howling of the waves'. Besides these stands ὀλολύζω, with dissimilation o-u or perhaps ablauting to ἐλελεῦ. It is interesting to note that Heliodorus makes a gender distinction in the use of the verb in *Aethiopica* 3.5.2.4, as he uses the regular ὠλόλυξαν for women, whereas he prefers ἡλάλαξαν for men.

a flock of swans was once seen in the Libyan Sea, singing a well-tuned chorus (ὥς ἐκ χοροῦ τινος ὁμοφώνου), sweet but sad, which moved those who listened to it to piety. It is interesting to note that the philosopher uses the idea of homophony to illustrate their singing, which is usually employed to depict the unison or octave singing of the chorus. Ptolemy (*Harm.* 1.7.9-11) defines ὁμόφωνοι as the notes that, when in contact, produce the sensation of being just one sound in our ears (οἱ κατὰ τὴν σύμψαυσιν ἐνὸς ἀντίληψιν ἐμποιοῦντες ταῖς ἀκοαῖς), as the octaves and their compounds (ὥς οἱ διὰ πασῶν καὶ οἱ ἐξ αὐτῶν συντιθέμενοι), whereas Aristides Quintilianus (1.6.71f.) asserts that they are those that differ in function (δύναμιν), but have the same pitch (τάσιν). Therefore, I propose that we interpret Aristotle's description as an organized choral song of animals that dominate the rules of a fine and well-tuned practice that can be applied to theoretical music in ancient Greece, in accordance with the most perfect method of physics.

But, without any doubt, the most exquisite image of musical swans is related to Apollo and the activity at his temple in Delos. The god's *hieron* had a special lake on this island, an exotic characteristic that linked the temple to similar ones in Egypt, a connection that can be observed when Herodotus compares it with the one at Athena's temple in Sais (Hdt. 2.170.1-4). It had an elliptical shape, because of which it was called the 'trocoides lake' (Hdt. 2.171.1: λίμνη [...] ἣ ἐν Δήλῳ ἢ τροχοειδὴς καλεομένη). There, swans use their powerful singing I have already described to honour Apollo. Do we have any way to trace the beginning of the relationship between Apollo and the swans? According to Callimachus, the union between the god and these animals goes back to the very moment when he was born, for, in his *Hymn to Delos* (249-54), swans abandon the river Pactolo in Lydia so that they can fly to assist Leto's delivery. They do it surrounding the circular lake seven times, and the writer uses that trope to illustrate the reason that Apollo added seven strings to the lyre, as the metaphorical origin of a literary heptatony:

Κύνκοι δὲ θεοῦ μέλποντες αἰδοί
 Μηόνιον Πακτωλὸν ἐκυκλώσαντο λιπόντες
 ἐβδομάκις περὶ Δήλον, ἐπήεισαν δὲ λοχείῃ
 Μουσᾶων ὄρνιθες, αἰδιδότατοι πετεηνῶν
 (ἐνθεν ὁ παῖς τοσσάσδε λύρη ἐνεδήσατο χορδὰς
 ὕστερον, ὅσσάκι κύκνοι ἐπ' ὠδίνεσσιν ἄεισαν).

And the swans, singing *aoidoi* of the god,
 leaving the Pactolean Meonion²⁷ surrounded

27 A river in Meonia, the ancient name for Lydia.

seven times Delos and seven times they sang the delivery
like birds of the Muses, the winged-best-melodious ones
(that is why the boy tied afterwards as many strings to the lyre
as the swans celebrated his birth).

This image is concordant with Eur. *HF* 687-94, where the playwright, who feels like an old singing swan, needs the chorus of maidens to make turns like the swans in Delos:

παιᾶνα μὲν Δηλιάδες
ὕμνουσ' ἄμφι πύλας τὸν
Λατοῦς εὐπαιδα γόνον
εἰλίσσονται καλλίχορον·
παιᾶνας δ' ἐπὶ σοῖς μελά-
θροισ κύκνος ὥς γέρων ἀοι-
δὸς πολιᾶν ἐκ γενύων
κελαδήσω.

Daughters of Delos
that sing the *paian* among the gates
for the good child of Leto
and make turns with their beautiful chorus.
So shall I, singer of *paian*, in front of your palaces
like an old swan
from my grey-haired mouth
sing.

Along with the same idea, Claudius Aelianus (*NA* 11.1.1-30) describes how during the feast of the hyperboreans and of Apollo in the island, swans descend from the fabulous mountain range of Ripai, in the far North, to join the singers in their chorus, using the verbal form συναναμέλπουσιν (cf. *Hecat. FGrHist* 1 F 12.14). The verb μέλπω, whose etymology is dubious, can be used for describing 'singing and dancing' in general terms, but can also mean 'celebrating with song and dance'. The use of the preverb²⁸ ἀνα- indicates the religious character of that singing, as can be seen in *Anacreontea* 38.2 and 38.27 and in many passages of Christian literature, so that, when it is preceded with both συν- and ἀνα-, it illustrates the idea of swans lending their voices to the priests and human chorus of the god.

28 For this usage of the term 'preverb' see Haug 2013.

Aelianus (*ibidem*) goes on to say that they do it with an ‘overharmonious music’ (οἱ κιθαρισταὶ συγκρέκωσι τῷ χορῷ παναρμόνιον μέλος). Their flying around the temple purifies it (περιελθόντες τὸν νεῶν καὶ οἶονει καθήραντες αὐτὸν τῇ πτήσει), reminding us again of the use of their wingbeat as an instrument, this time with obvious religious intentions. This writer insists on the fact that these animals never sing out of tune or flat (καὶ οὐδαμῶς οὐδαμῇ ἀπηγές καὶ ἀπῳδὸν ἐκείνοι μελωδοῦντες), and behave like real professionals when they accompany the experts with their singing (τοῖς σοφισταῖς τῶν ἱερῶν μελῶν τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις συνάσαντες) as if they had received the *endosimon* from the coryphaeus (ἀλλὰ ὥσπερ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ χορολέκτου τὸ ἐνδοσίμον λαβόντες). Once the hymn is over, the winged-choreutai celebrate the god for the whole day and fly away (εἴτα τοῦ ὕμνου τελεσθέντος οἱ δὲ ἀναχωροῦσι τῇ πρὸς τὸν δαίμονα τιμῇ τὰ εἰθισμένα λατρεύσαντες καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν ἡμέραν οἱ προειρημένοι ὡς εἰπεῖν χορευταὶ πτηνοὶ μέλιψαντές τε ἅμα καὶ ἄσαντες). It is interesting to highlight that this writer illuminates the scene as if it were a chorus in a drama in which the group is led by an individual singer, the so-called ‘conductor of the chorus’ (χορολέκτης) who, as was usual in the practice of the non-professional members of the chorus of a play in the festivals, gives the rest of the group the *endosimon*, i.e. the beginning of the melody, which will let the others join him in tune for their singing.

This is one of the richest descriptions of swans’ literary qualification as musicians and that is why Plutarch (*De E ap. Delph.* 387c.7f.) affirms that Apollo rejoices with music in general, and with the *kykneion asma* and the sound of the *kitharis* in particular, perhaps because (Lucian *Electr.* 4.1-6.24) the swans were in ancient times his ‘singing mates’ (ῥθικὸὺς ἀνθρώπους) transformed into birds that have not forgotten their music yet (διὰ τοῦτο ἄδειν ἔτι οὐκ ἐκλαθόμενους τῆς μουσικῆς).

In order to complete this musical picture, I shall use Philostratus’ description of a painting (*Im.* 1.9.4.1-8) in which Zephyrus points at a flock of swans singing in the *orthios nomos*, which was a high pitched *nomos* (ὄρθιος is a synonym for ὀξύς and λιγύς in a musical context; cf. Eur. *Tr.* 1266f.: ὀρθίαν ὅταν / σάλπιγγος ἡχώ δῶσιν ἀρχηγοὶ στρατοῦ [‘when] the leaders of the army give the high-pitched sound of the *salpinx*’), that was used to uplift the feelings of those that heard it. In this sense, it can be found in Hdt. 1.24.19-21 (‘standing—scil. Arion—in his best robes, he attacked the *orthios nomos*, and having finished it, he threw himself into the sea’) and Ar. *Eq.* 1278f. (‘nowadays, everyone who knows the white colour and the *orthios nomos*, knows Arignotus’). Zephyrus is conducting the animals, playing them as if they were instruments (1.11.3.9: ψάλλειν αὐτοὺς οἷον ὄργανα), while they spread their wings and beat them accompanied by the wind (ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνέμου), using the same grammatical construction (ὑπὸ + genitive) to express the idea of the wind as an instrument that

enhances their music. Furthermore, it is done in the Phrygian rhythm, as it appears in *Anacreontea* (60.5-10):

λιγυρὸν μέλος κροαίνων
 Φρυγίῳ ῥυθμῷ βοήσω,
 ἄτε τις κύκνος Καῦστρου
 ποικίλον πετροῖσι μέλπων
 ἀνέμου σύναυλος ἡχήι

the high melody stamping
 with Phrygian rhythm, I'll cry
 what some swan of the Caystrus
 sings in variety with its wings,
 accompanied with the sound of the wind.

This example is quite interesting, as the Phrygian harmony and rhythm were believed to be imported to Greece from Asia Minor, along with the Lydian ones, by those who reached the Peloponese when they travelled from their homelands accompanying Pelops on his journey. Athenaeus (14.625e-626a) relates this story following Telestes of Selinus' words (fr. 6.1-5 Page), and assigns their hymns to high-pitched songs of the *pectis*. This harmony and rhythm were quickly received and assimilated throughout Greece (Michaelides 1978, 255) and mainly used in dithyramb, as its characteristics could be easily associated with the music in honour of Dionysus, rightly the counterpart of Apollo. We need to understand the example from the *Anacreontea* as a song of joy in a shrill musical context, always taken in relation with the Delian and Pythian god whose *thiasos* is set up by his winged companions.

I hope I have been able to illustrate, according to the contents of the texts that have been found on the κύκνειον ᾠσμα, a picture of the main literary resources ancient Greek writers had at their disposal for describing their imaginative version of the Swan Song from a musical point of view. In that sense, they tried to exploit in every possible way any detail that could provide them with a more vivid and full-of-sound approach to enliven their words with music. Therefore, they made use, on the one hand, of all the natural details they could observe from swans in the wild, with their sounds, hisses and wing movement, and, on the other, of all the qualities literary tradition had associated with swans as the animal most easily represented as the best singer ever heard.

Bibliography

- Arnott, W. G. 1977. *Swan Songs*, Greece and Rome 24, 149-53.
- Aura Jorro, F. 1985. *Diccionario micénico* (2 vols.) (Madrid).
- Beekes, R. S. P., & Van Beek, L. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (2 vols.) (Leiden).
- Bignardi, G. 2013. *Osservazioni sul kúknos in Euripide*, Eikasmos 24, 77-89.
- Castrucci, G. 2014. *Il lago dei cigni di Delo: dal «threnos» al peana*, ACME 66, 53-78.
- Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (Paris).
- Crespo, E., Conti, L. & Maquieira, H. 2003. *Sintaxis del griego clásico* (Madrid).
- Donohue, H. 1993. *The Song of the Swan: Lucretius and the Influence of Callimachus* (Lanham, Maryland).
- Grimal, P. 1986. *Diccionario de mitología griega y romana* (Barcelona).
- Harris, J. P. 2012a. *Cassandra's Swan Song: Aeschylus' Use of Fable in Agamemnon*, GRBS 52, 540-58.
- Harris, J. P. 2012b. *The Swan's Red-Dipped Foot: Euripides, Ion* 161-9, CQ 62, 510-22.
- Haug, D. 2013. *Preverbs*, in: *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, Managing Editors Online Edition: First Last. Consulted online on 07 May 2017 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_SIM_00000519>
- Masetti, M. 1997. *Representations of birds in Minoan art*, International Journal of Osteoarchaeology 7, 354-63.
- Michaelides, S. 1978. *The Music of Ancient Greece. An Encyclopaedia* (London).
- Sberna, D. 2015. *Swan and Intratextual Unity in Callimachus's Aitia Prologue*, MD 74, 207-23.
- Tosi, R. 2000. *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche* (Milano).
- Toufexis, G. 2003. *Animals in the Neolithic Art of Thessaly*, British School at Athens Studies 9, 263-71.
- Vorreiter, L. 1975. *The Swan-Neck Lyres of Minoan-Mycenean Culture*, GSJ 28, 93-7.

Locusts, Grasshoppers and Cicadas as Muses

Different Ways of Visualising Insect Music in Antiquity

Florian Leitmeir

Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Department of Classical Archaeology

florian.leitmeir@uni-wuerzburg.de

Abstract

The music of the τέττιξ and the ἀρχίς is a prominent topos in ancient literature, especially in Hellenistic poetry. However, the musical ability of these insects is also depicted in ancient art and could be distinguished in three categories: first, artists realistically represent the *stridulatio*; second, they show the juxtaposition of animal and instrument, and third, the anthropomorphized insects playing instruments like human musicians. The last option in particular reminds one of the equation of the cicada with both the Muses and the Hellenistic poet himself.

Keywords

iconography – cicada – locust – anthropomorphization – *stridulatio*

From Homer onwards, ancient writers show a great fondness for the musical ability of insects, particularly the cicada and the locust/grasshopper/cricket.¹ By the time Plato created the tale of the cicadas as mediators between the Muses and humans (*Phdr.* 258e-259d), these animals seemed to be predestined for the representation of an *ars poetica*, if not the poets themselves. It is generally assumed that Hellenistic poetry ignored the real anatomical differences

1 Männlein-Robert 2007, 209-43, especially 209-12. For a compilation of ancient references for the sound production of the ἀρχίς/locusta see Gossen 1912; Keller 1913, 455-9; Beavis 1988, 71f.; Davies and Katirithamby 1986, 134f. Of the cicada: Keller 1913, 401-6; Steier 1934; Beavis 1988, 99-102; Davies and Katirithamby 1986, 116-22. I thank the MOISA-Committee for the possibility to discuss my ideas at the conference in Athens. I thank my colleagues M. Danner, M. Steinhart and C. Weiss for their helpful advice and C. Leitmeir for his great effort to correct my English paper.

between the cicada, the locust and the grasshopper so that these species were in effect all rolled into one, their sweet and continuous chirping indicative of a bucolic setting. The Anacreontic poem 34, in all probability composed in Late Antiquity, contains all the attributes for which the cicada has been traditionally praised; correspondingly her popularity among modern poets is not surprising.²

The study of the representation of these animals in Greek and Roman art would commonly be considered as a peripheral area of Classical Archaeology. But actually, as this article will argue, the ancient iconography of these sonoric little animals offers profound insights into music iconography at large, including the problems and possibilities of capturing music, with its ultimately performative and transient nature, into an image both still and mute.

1 Introduction: Classification and Etymology

Before studying the iconography of the musical insects, I shall make some preliminary remarks about the ancient nomenclature and the zoological definition of the species discussed here, especially in relation to their techniques of producing sound.

In Linnaeus's classification, the cicadas belong to the order of the *homoptera*, the locust/grasshopper/cricket to that of the *orthoptera*. Visually, their difference becomes manifest, for example, in the proportion between the length of the wings to the length of the insect's body and the mouth. Moreover, the body shape of the locusts and crickets is long and thin, whereas the cicadas' shape is of notable breadth. A further distinction can be made within the group of the orthopteran *saltatoria* in *ensifera* and *caelifera*, i.e. with long and short antennae, respectively. In contrast to locusts, crickets have only long antennae.³

2 Anacreont. 34: Μακαρίζομέν σε, τέττιξ, / ὅτε δενδρέων ἐπ' ἄκρων / ὀλίγην δρόσον πεπωκώς / βασιλεὺς ὅπως αἰεῖδεις. / σὰ γὰρ ἔστι κείνα πάντα / ὅπόσα βλέπεις ἐν ἀγροῖς / †κοπόσα† φέρουσιν ὕλαι. / σὺ δὲ φείδεται γεωργῶν, / ἀπὸ μηδενός τι βλάπτων· / σὺ δὲ τίμιος βροτοῖσιν, / θέρεος γλυκὺς προφήτης. / φιλέουσι μὲν σε Μοῦσαι, / φιλέει δὲ Φοῖβος αὐτός, / λιγυρὴν δ' ἔδωκεν οἶμν· / τὸ δὲ γήρας οὐ σε τείρει. / σοφέ, γηγενής, φίλυμνε, / ἀπαθής, ἀναιμόσαρκε· / σχεδὸν εἰ θεοῖς ὅμοιος. Cf. Zotou 2014, 183-9.

3 Cf. Bährmann 2008, 96f.; Hennig 1968, 179-83. A further subdivision in the species we could neglect here. For such a detailed study the depiction of the animals in ancient art is seldom sufficiently specific.

The Greek word for cicada is τέτιξ (Latin: *cicada*), a term often regarded as onomatopoeic, as it imitates the characteristic sound of the animal.⁴ The ancient nomenclature for the locust/grasshopper/cricket is instead more complicated. Greek writers were not aware of the accurate distinction between the orthopterans that is common in modern biology. This being said, there may be a telling difference between Greek and Latin. The single Latin term *locusta* finds its equivalent in multiple Greek words, among them ἀκρίς, ἀτέλαβος, πάρνοψ and βροῦχος, to list but the most popular designations.⁵ Instead of an anatomical description, the ancient nomenclature here expresses the kind of effect of the locust/grasshopper/cricket in relation to human beings. Accordingly, the word ἀκρίς refers to the harmless species, i.e. locusts, grasshoppers or crickets, which are beneficial to the man: physically, as source of food, and aurally, because of their music.⁶ Indeed, for ancient authors, their sound-producing mechanism affords the sole criterion to distinguish between locust, grasshopper or cricket. The former two species stridulate by scraping with the hind leg on the wing.⁷ A file on one wing of the cricket, on the other hand, is rubbed by a scraper on the other wing.⁸

In contrast to the *stridulatio* of the orthoptera, cicadas produce sound by the vibration of the so-called tymbal, in the anterior abdomen, using the largely hollow abdomen as a sound box.⁹

These differences between the species are fundamental to a discussion of their depiction. Inherent in them is a severe iconographical challenge: while the *stridulatio* of the locust or even the cricket can be easily depicted, it is impossible to visualize the sound production of the cicadas, which takes place in the interior of the body, hidden from the eyes of the spectator. This paper will suggest a solution to this problem, and in unison with ancient writers, will further dwell on the special theme of this journal: music. We should assert that the name for the music-making animal is certainly ἀκρίς, and all the other words are used in general for the destructive version of the insect. The word

4 Cf. Keller 1913, 406; Davies and Kathirithamby 1986, 113f. Beavis (1988, 93-6) lists many other words for the cicada, in general used as synonyms of specific regional species and only recorded by ancient lexicographers.

5 Cf. Beavis 1988, 62-9; Davies and Kathirithamby 1986, 144-9. Fundamental is Gow 1956.

6 Davies and Kathirithamby 1986, 134-44.

7 See Ingrisch and Köhler 1998, 220-7. Cf. Arist. *HA* 535b11-12; Plin. *HN* 11.112, 167; *AP* 7.195 (Meleager).

8 Cf. *AP* 7.192, 194 (Mnasalces); *AP* 7.197 (Phaennos); Ael. *NA* 6.19.

9 Claridge 1985. Already Aristotle informs us about the diverse sound production: Arist. *HA* 532b17, 535b7; also Plin. *HN* 11.266.

ἀκρίς could therefore mean either locust/grasshopper or cricket, and I will use that in the following for the musical orthopteran.¹⁰

2 Music Iconography

The popularity of these insects, especially their ability to produce sound, poses the question, how ancient artists depicted these sonoric insects also according to the different methods of producing sound.¹¹ There are different ways of visualizing those musicians and music in general.¹²

2.1 ἀκρίς

Two silver medallions in Munich,¹³ dating to the second century BC, which adorned the inner centre of a cup supposedly from Nihawand in Iran, Ancient Persia, depict an ἀκρίς¹⁴ (Figure 1). The insect is sitting on a vine-branch eating the blossom of the grapevine.¹⁵ At first sight this image does not seem very significant; in fact, previous archaeologists' studies were concerned with questions of the technique and chronology of the relief rather than with its iconography. Recently, Carina Weiss discussed it in her study of the harmful aspect of the locust in ancient images.¹⁶ But the image also reveals an arresting visual detail: the depiction of the *stridulatio*, as the hind leg with spines is raised to the wings. Therefore the medallions with the ἀκρίδες could be part of a bucolic decoration, as we could observe in other silver vessels, unless animals are seldom used for such an adornment.¹⁷

For the purposes of this paper, one can recognize in these silver reliefs not only a very close representation of two qualities of the animal, but even a spe-

10 Davies and Katirithamby 1986, 134-44.

11 For a compilation of the ancient images of the ἀκρίς and τέττιξ see Schauenburg 1996, 113-21 (not focused on the sound-production of the insects).

12 A comprehensive study of the ancient iconography of music is in preparation by the author. To my knowledge that problem has not been discussed by earlier scholars. For some interesting remarks see Staiti 1994.

13 München, SL 661 a/b, dm. 7,9 cm, Nihawand/Iran; Steinhart and Wünsche 2009, 61-6 nrs. 15f.

14 In my opinion, we can see here a species of the *acrididae*; we cannot decide here between a locust or a grasshopper because of the missing colouring.

15 The animal is not eating the grapes, cf. Leitmeir 2012, 114, 127. See also Weiss 2015, 299.

16 Weiss 2015.

17 See for example also the ekphrasis of Theoc. *Id.* 1.27-56.



FIGURE 1 *Two Silver Medallions, Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen, SL 661a/b.*
©PHOTO: RENATE KÜHLING.

cific iconography for music: the very moment when the insect produces sound. To my knowledge, this motif is found only once more on a classical gem that also shows the raised hind leg of the ἀχρίς—at the price of not depicting its voracious plant-eating.¹⁸

Another way of articulating the musical ability of the ἀχρίς is found on a Tarentine silver medallion from the cover of a mirror case (Figure 2).¹⁹ The relief depicts the morning toilet of Aphrodite, sitting on a rock; on her left, a boy wears a basket above his head (Eros?), and a girl is standing on a base on her right.²⁰ Between these characters are a flower and a butterfly carved in low relief, beneath the girl a heart-shaped fan is placed. Interestingly, the lower part also contains panpipes, a bird, possibly a raven, an ἀχρίς and a *kithara*. Above the tails of the animals there are two stars or flowers. The combination of those animals with musical instruments is unique in the iconography of Aphrodite.

18 Paris, Louvre A 1228, blue chalcedony tabloid. Boardman 2001, 338 nr. 893.

19 Silver medallion, London, British Museum 1853, 0314.1, from Tarentum, usually dated to the fourth-third centuries BC, but more likely to late Republic/early Augustan period (Zahlhaas 1975, 39); see also Walters 1921, 16 nr. 71 fig. 22; Reinsberg 1980, 260-2; Merriman 2009, 9. Even here one cannot distinguish between locust and grasshopper.

20 The iconography of the whole relief is unique. Following Reinsberg 1980, it seems to be a variation of a cast of a wax-model in Hildesheim, Inv. nr. 1128, with Aphrodite and a statue of Hekate (?).



FIGURE 2 *Silver Medallion, London, British Museum 1853,0314.1.*
©TRUSTEES OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

Traditionally they have been interpreted as a reference to Apollo.²¹ The attribution of the ἀρχίς to Apollo is notable in referring to Apollo Parnopios who killed the destructive parnopes. I will propose an alternative reading to the destructive explanation of the ἀρχίς in the lower part of relief, separating the objects into two groups comprised of an animal, an instrument and the star/flower. The bird (crow/raven?) is linked with the panpipes and the ἀρχίς with the *kithara*, the wind instrument with the singing of the bird and the stringed instrument with the *stridulatio* of the insect. Animals and instruments presumably emphasize the eroticizing power of Aphrodite, as it appears for instance in the iconography of weddings on vases.²² This reading is also supported by the possible function of the whole object as a wedding gift.

2.2 τέτιξ

The popularity of the sound-producing cicada in ancient Hellenistic poetry²³ makes it unsurprising that it outnumbers the ἀρχίς in ancient depictions. But how did artists represent the—invisible—sound production of cicadas? A direct juxtaposition of cicada and instrument—as for the ἀρχίς—is attested on some gems.²⁴ Yet, more commonly, ancient artists solved the problem of invisible sound-making with the anthropomorphization of the cicadas.²⁵

- 21 See Birch 1852, 271 (this scholar, however, interpreted the panpipes as a letter-box). Mayer (1910, 44-6) singles the two instruments out, but proposes a different reading of the relief: the female person should be the personification of Cos, the girl of Nisyros and the boy of Telos. The instruments and the animals (“raven and cicada (sic!)”) should be symbols for Asklepios and the poets Theocritus and Philetas, both praising the isle of Cos. In spite of this improbable interpretation of the whole relief, Mayer connects the animals with the musical instruments.
- 22 See for instance the Attic red-figure Loutrophoros by the Washing Painter, Athens, National Museum 1174; Oakley and Sinos 1993, fig. 85. The scene of the *nymphetria* is accompanied by a representation of Eros playing the *auloi*. Eros is depicted between the bride and the groom, as an element typical of wedding scenes and an affirmation of the power of Aphrodite, which is stressed also by music.
- 23 Pataki 2013; Männlein-Robert 2007, 209-43.
- 24 We could consider for instance two carved carnelian gemstones in Berlin (Antikensammlung, FG 7955 and FG 7956 with a cicada and a cricket, sitting on a lyre). A further carnelian gemstone (Berlin, Antikensammlung, FG 8038; cf. Vollenweider 1972, pl. 147.2) is carved with the portrait of a roman youth (Octavian?), crops, *lituus* (?), and a cricket with panpipes (no anthropomorphization).
- 25 The identification of the animal in published catalogues with a cicada is sometimes erroneous, and there is some confusion with grasshoppers and flies.

On several gems the cicada plays instruments of human musicians: *auloi*²⁶ (Figure 3), *kithara*²⁷ (Figure 4) and *trigonon*.²⁸ In two further cases, a cicada plays the Phrygian *aulos*, next to a column with a sun-dial on top (Figure 5).²⁹

Certainly, the phenomenon of the anthropomorphization of the cicada—like that of the *ἄρκις* or other animals—is not only attested for musical activities, but also for other activities such as fighting and fishing, or scenes of the upside down world.³⁰ In the limited scope of this essay, I cannot provide a comprehensive coverage of all such humanized insects, but have to focus on their music-making.³¹ All the while, the separate interpretation of the group of musicians springs from another motif. Cicadas and grasshoppers are usually depicted in action—which they typically perform in contemporary literature. Famed for their musical ability, activities such as fighting and fishing are

-
- 26 Sard, London, British Museum 1867.0507.212, Walters 1926, 1472: beneath an Eros playing the *kithara* (not visible). Sard, London, British Museum 1923.0401.323; Walters 1926, 2562: grasshopper in front of a burning altar/cippus with conical top and butterfly/small column with a winged figure (?).
- 27 Sard, London, British Museum 1814.0704.1447; Walters 1926, 2550. The cloak behind, around the neck of the cicada has been explained as a lion-skin. If this is true, another part of the lion-skin is fixed on the *kithara*. See also Vandlik 2016, comparing a gem with a lyre-playing ass (Basel, Historisches Museum 1987.252) wearing the same lion skin as the cicada.
- 28 Sard sealstone, London, British Museum 1889.0810.18, Walters 1926, 1207 (no figure), (grasshopper?).
- 29 Carnelian, Berlin, Antikensammlung FG 6525, Zwierlein and Diehl 1969, nr. 424. Rubin(?), Wien IX B 1039, Zwierlein and Diehl 1979, nr. 1128 (instead of a sun-dial maybe a bird?).
- 30 Fighting: Wien, XII 1206, Zwierlein and Diehl 1979, nr. 1129 (against a crane); chalcodon, Berlin, Antikensammlung FG 6524, Zwierlein and Diehl 1969, nr. 425 (shield and sword); brown glass, Berlin, Antikensammlung, FG 5803 (beating a cock with a hammer); chalcodon, Berlin, Antikensammlung FG 6523 (two cicadas fighting against each other); carnelian, Berlin, Antikensammlung FG 6526 (holding a hoe); sard, London, British Museum 1814.0704.1448 (cicada with pelta-shield and axe), Walters 1926, 2551. Fishing: Wien, XI B541, Zwierlein and Diehl 1979, 853. Upside-down world: carnelian, Berlin, Antikensammlung, FG 7957 (cicada on a chariot drawn by two butterflies); carnelian, Berlin, Antikensammlung FG 7958 (cicada on a chariot drawn by two dogs), Imhoof-Blumer and Keller, 1889, pl. 16, 7; sard, London, British Museum 1814.0704.1445 (cicada ploughing with a team of two flies), Walters 1926, 2548. See also Kenner 1970, 26-8, 48f.; Schauenburg 1996, 117f.
- 31 For anthropomorphized music-making animals cf. also the Attic black figure Siana-cup from Vulci, Rome, Mus. Naz. Etrusco di Villa Giulia 64608, with an *aulos*-playing dolphin with arms; Cf. Icard-Gianolio and Szabados 2009, 352 nr. 89. I thank the reviewer for this suggestion.



FIGURE 3 *Sard, London, British Museum 1923.0401.323.*
©TRUSTEES OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM.



FIGURE 4 *Sard, London, British Museum 1814.0704.1447.*
©TRUSTEES OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM.



FIGURE 5 *Berlin, Antikensammlung FG 6525.*
©BPK/ANTIKENSAMMLUNG,
SMB/JOHANNES
LAURENTIUS.

not mentioned for them. Such 'real images' can be further defined in contrast with other animals shown as musicians (e.g. cats, mice, donkeys or a stork).³² Besides, we have to consider first that such objects are from Egypt or the Near

32 Kenner 1970, 49-59.

East;³³ second, as Kenner had observed, they belong to the scenery of the paradisiac world. Correspondingly, there is no need to explain objects with these images as magic, apotropaic items.³⁴

An alternative interpretation was proposed by Böhme and Schauenburg.³⁵ Böhme explains these images with reference to the Orphic myths;³⁶ Schauenburg sees the images of the cicadas and the ἀρχίς as eschatological references to death and the idea of an afterlife.³⁷ Both scholars refer to other attitudes in ancient literature towards these insects, besides music: their asceticism, with the morning dew as their only food,³⁸ and the start of their life as earth-born creatures. As Aristotle and others observed, the nymphs, after they have hatched, burrow into the ground and emerge from the soil as a fully developed cicada.³⁹

Along with these discussions, we must consider third the immortality and assimilation to the Muses that has been attributed to cicadas in poems.⁴⁰

The anthropomorphization of the cicada—and the ἀρχίς—in fact provides enticing parallels with the comparison of ancient poets with these insects. The

33 E.g. the Lyre of Ur (Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Museum of Archeology and Anthropology, Inv. B17694A, Aruz 2003, 105f.) or the Papyrus 55001 from Turin (Kenner 1970, 50f., fig. 22; Vandlik 2016, fig. 1).

34 Cf. Kenner 1970, especially 26, 28, 49. She explains the popularity of the grasshoppers and cicadas, but also of the mice, for example, with their character as “Seelentier”. Furtwängler (1900, 3.298) instead refers to a depiction of “volkstümliche Koblde”. For the apotropaic interpretation see also Lullies 1960, 146f.

35 Böhme 1954; Schauenburg 1996.

36 I have reservations against the hypothesis that such late Hellenistic or early Imperial gems referred to that complex myth; yet, that does not affect the gist of my paper.

37 Schauenburg 1996, 120f.

38 Cf. also the myth told by Plato (*Phdr.* 258e-259d).

39 Cf. Arist. *HA* 556b6, 601a6f; Plin. *HN* 11.93. For a detailed discussion, cf. Borthwick 1966, 107-12. I could only point out in my paper to two other images of a single cicada: small golden brooches in form of cicadas have been discussed in combination with ancient texts (e.g. Thuc. 1.6.3) as symbols for the autochthonic Athenians. Cf. Rumpf 1949; Cook 1940, 250-61. Other depictions, like the terracotta-cicada in the center of a phiale made by the famous potter Sotades (Attic red figure, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 98.886) were additionally explained as a symbol of immortality, cf. Hofmann 1997, 113-8. However, I want to focus attention on the musical abilities of cicadas since it has not been considered in interpretations of those cicadas. First and foremost for those animals their musical power, also praised by the ancient poets, should be considered in the interpretations.

40 Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.29-35; *Anacreont.* 34.12-4.

relevant gems are very illuminating, considering the ancient epigrams.⁴¹ Just as could be observed in the anthropomorphizing iconography, their music is, in line with ancient literature, equal to that of the Muses and real human musicians.

A mythological connection with the cicada is forged through the the story of Tithonos.⁴² Eos, who had fallen in love with the mortal Tithonos, obtained immortality for him from the gods. Having failed to request eternal youth, she had to see her lover becoming an old man. Finally she transformed him into a cicada.⁴³ Ancient artists typically visualized only one episode of the myth, the amorous pursuit of Tithonos by Eos. Of the two beloved youths, Tithonos and Kephalos, that Eos has been pursuing, Tithonos is depicted with a lyre.⁴⁴ Arguably, one can find here also a hint of the musicality of Tithonos and his human afterlife as a cicada.

The relevance of the musical ability of cicadas becomes even clearer in their depictions on statues, mentioned only in ancient texts. Strabo and others relate the story of the Locrian citharoedus Eunomos, for whom a statue was erected in Locri with a τέττιξ sitting on his cithara. During a musical competition, one string of his cithara snapped, and a cicada supplied the sound of the missing chord.⁴⁵ With the help of the insect, Eunomos defeats Ariston, of

41 *AP* 7.198 (Leonidas); *AP* 6.120 (Leonidas); *AP* 12.98 (Poseidippos). Cf. Männlein and Robert 2007, 226–37.

42 Davies and Kathiritamby 1986, 126f.; Kossatz-Deissmann 1997.

43 *H.Ven.* 218–38; Hellenic. BNJ 4 F 140 cf. Pownall, Frances, “Hellānikos of Lesbos (4)”, in: Brill’s New Jacoby, Editor in Chief: Ian Worthington (University of Missouri). Consulted online on 04 April 2017.

44 Cook (1940, 250–60) tends to interpret the person of Tithonos as a personification of the cicada, stating “that he bore a name which is primarily onomatopoeic” (266). For the iconography of Eos and Tithonos see Kaempf-Dimitriadou 1979, 16–21; Weiss 1986, 758, 764–8; Kossatz-Deissmann 1997. Although the iconography of Tithonos and Kephalos is not sufficiently established, we could in my opinion distinguish between Tithonos, youth with a lyre, and Kephalos, youth bearing spears. The few images with Kephalos secured by inscription depict him as hunter. The reading of the inscription on the Attic red figure lekythos in Madrid, Mus. Arch. 11158, in CVA Madrid 2 pl. 13 (70) 2a. b, Weiss 1986, nr. 268 (Conde 2015, 46 fig. 15) as “kalos Kephalos” is not convincing. Further has been transformed the Tithonos-persecution-Motif on a cup in Berlin for Kephalos but without the lyre (Attic red figure cup, F 2537, Weiss 1986 nr. 274). I won’t assume, that Tithonos persecuted by Eos has always been depicted with a lyre, but vice versa it seems more probable that adding the lyre to Tithonos could be a hint for his life as a cicada. See also Bundrick (2005, 64f.) for an eroticizing interpretation.

45 Str. 6.1.9; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 1.2–3. Further references for Eunomos are listed in Niutta 1977, 267. Another statue of the τέττιξ and also a grasshopper have been made according to

neighbouring Rhegium. While such ekphrastic texts may not be based on a real statue, even the imagined object represents the power of the cicada's music. Strabo's version of the story, for instance, refers to the geographical situation in Locri. The dry and sunny climate enables the cicada to sing, which would not have been possible in the dampness of Rhegium.⁴⁶ Clemens of Alexandria, on the contrary, stresses that Eunomus' victory was not achieved with his song featuring the cicada-pitch. The song of the cicada alone, which praised God (τῷ θεῷ τῷ πανσόφῳ) rather than Apollo, is turned into a symbol for natural, αὐτόνομος music, superior to the artificial human *nomos*.

3 Conclusion: ἀκρίς, τέττιξ and the Iconography of Music

In conclusion, let us return to the question of the iconography of the music of insects. Cicadas and grasshoppers are the most popular insects in ancient texts. My iconographical study reveals several options to capture music in a mute image. First, the close anatomical depiction of the stridulation of the ἀκρίς follows those examples of other human musicians depicted while playing an instrument or singing. The juxtaposition of an insect and an instrument, made and played by humans, paved the path to a third option, the anthropomorphizing iconography. As in ancient texts, their music is closer to the music of the Muses and of real human musicians. Even this third option could be seen as a reflection of the attitudes of ancient authors towards cicadas.

Bibliography

- Aruz, J. (ed.) 2003. *Art of the First Cities. The Third Millennium B.C. From the Mediterranean to the Indus* (New York).
- Bährmann, R. (ed.) 2008. *Bestimmung wirbelloser Tiere, Bildtafeln für zoologische Bestimmungsübungen und Exkursionen* (Heidelberg).
- Beavis, I. 1988. *Insects and Other Invertebrates in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford).
- Birch, S. 1852. *On a Silver Disc from Tarentum*, *Archaeologia* 34, 265-72.
- Boardman, J. 2001. *Greek Gems and Finger Rings: Early Bronze Age to Late Classical*, 2nd edition (London).

Pliny (*HN* 34.57) by the famous sculptor Myron. However commentators explain this ascription as a misunderstanding of Μυρῶ in *AP* 7.190 (Anyte). Cf. Schauenburg 1996, 115.

46 See Beavis 1988, 97f. Furthermore the victory over Ariston of Rhegium with the support of a Delphic cicada stresses the political hegemony over Rhegium. Cf. Beavis 1988, 98 n. 40.

- Borthwick, E.K. 1966. *A Grasshopper's Diet-Notes on an Epigram of Meleager and a Fragment of Eubulus*, CQ 16, 1, 103-12.
- Böhme, R. 1954. *Unsterbliche Grillen*, JDAI 69, 49-66.
- Bundrick, S. 2005. *Music and Image in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
- Claridge, M.F. 1985. *Acoustic Signals in the Homoptera: Behavior, Taxonomy, and Evolution*, Annual Review of Entomology 30, 297-317.
- Conde, M.M. 2015. *Las edades de la vida: infancia y vejez a través de la iconografía griega*, in: Iriarte, A., de Nazaré Ferreira, L. (eds.) *Idades e género na literatura e na arte de Grécia antiga* (Coimbra), 31-60.
- Cook, A.B. 1940. *Zeus*, vol. 3, (Cambridge).
- Davies, M., Katirithamby, J. 1986. *Greek Insects* (London).
- Furtwängler, A. 1900. *Die antiken Gemmen: Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst im Klassischen Altertum*, 3 vols. (Leipzig/Berlin).
- Gossen, H. 1912, in: *RE* 8, 1381-1386, s.v. Heuschrecke.
- Gow, A.S.F. 1956. *Mnasalces: Notes and Queries*, CR 6, 2, 91-5.
- Hennig, W. 1968. *Wirbellose*, 2, *Gliedertiere* (Jena).
- Hofmann, H. 1997. *Sotades. Symbols of Immortality on Greek Vases* (Oxford).
- Icard-Gianolio, N., Szabados, A.-V. 2009, in: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* Suppl., 339-59, s.v. *monstra*.
- Imhoof-Blumer, F., Keller, O. 1889. *Tier- und Pflanzenbilder auf Münzen und Gemmen des Klassischen Altertums* (Leipzig).
- Ingrisch, S., Köhler, G. 1998. *Die Heuschrecken Mitteleuropas* (Magdeburg).
- Kaempf-Dimitriadou, S. 1979. *Die Liebe der Götter in der attischen Kunst des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, (Basel).
- Keller, O. 1913. *Die antike Tierwelt*, 2 (Leipzig).
- Kenner, H. 1970. *Das Phänomen der verkehrten Welt in der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Bonn).
- Kossatz-Deissmann, A. 1997, in: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 8, 34-6, s.v. Tithonos.
- Leitmeir, F. 2012. *Antike Musiker aus der Sammlung Loeb*, in: Forster, R. (ed.), *Die Musikaliensammlung von James Loeb. Eine Wiederentdeckung* (Augsburg), 112-27.
- Lullies, R. 1960. *BATPAXOI*, in: Eckstein, F. (ed.), *ΘΕΟΠΙΑ. Festschrift für W.-H. Schuchhardt* (Baden-Baden), 139-49.
- Männlein-Robert I. 2007. *Stimme, Schrift und Bild. Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung* (Heidelberg).
- Mayer, M. 1910. *La coppa tarantina di argento dorato del Museo provinciale di Bari* (Bari).
- Merriman, P. 2009. *Silver* (Cambridge/Mass.).
- Niutta, F. 1977. *Le fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche*, in: Barra Bagnasco, M., Niutta, F. et al., *Locri Epizefiri I* (Florence), 253-355.
- Oakley, J.H., Sinos, R.H. 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Wisconsin).

- Pataki, E. 2013. *A tücsök mint szakrális-poétikai szimbólum az ókori görög irodalomban* (Budapest).
- Reinsberg, C. 1980, *Studien zur hellenistischen Toreutik: die antiken Gipsabgüsse aus Memphis* (Hildesheim).
- Rumpf, A. 1949. *Tettix*, in: *Symbola Coloniensia: Iosepho Kroll sexagenario A.D. VI. Id. Nov. a. MCMIL oblata* (Köln), 85-99.
- Schauenburg, K. 1996. *Die Heuschrecke auf dem Askos*, NAC 25, 105-30.
- Staiti, N. 1994. *Musica Imaginum: Representations of Music ad Oral Tradition*, in: Heckmann H., Holl, M., Marx, H.J. (eds.), *Musikalische Ikonographie* (Laaber), 263-70.
- Steier, A. 1934, in *RE* V A2, 1111-9, s.v. *tettix*.
- Steinhart, M., Wünsche, R. 2009. *Sammlung James Loeb. Forschungen der Staatlichen Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek 1* (Lindenberg).
- Vandlík, K. 2016. *L'Ane, la lyre et peau de lion*, AntK 59, 38-43.
- Vollenweider, M.-L. 1972-1974. *Die Porträtgemmen der römischen Republik*, 2 vols., (Berlin).
- Walters, H.B. 1921. *Catalogue of the Silver Plate (Greek, Etruscan and Roman) in the British Museum* (London).
- Walters, H.B. 1926. *Catalogue of Engraved Gems and Cameos, Greek, Etruscan and Roman in the British Museum* (London).
- Weiss, C. 1986, in: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 3, 747-89, s.v. Eos.
- Weiss, C. 2015. *Heuschrecken auf griechischen Vasen und in der Glyptik*, in: Lang-Auinger, C., Trinkl, E. (eds.), *ΦΥΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΖΩΙΑ. Pflanzen und Tiere auf Griechischen Vasen*, CVA Österreich 2 (Wien), 299-309.
- Zahlhaas, G. 1975. *Römische Reliefspiegel* (Kallmünz).
- Zotou, A. 2014. *Carmina Anacreontea 1-34. Ein Kommentar* (Berlin).
- Zwierlein-Diehl, E. 1969. *Antike Gemmen in deutschen Sammlungen*, vol. 2. (München).
- Zwierlein-Diehl, E. 1979. *Die antiken Gemmen des Kunsthistorischen Museums in Wien*, vol. 2 (München).

La part d'Henri Weil dans l'édition du *De la musique* attribué à Plutarque (Paris, E. Leroux, 1900)

Laurent Calvié

Centre Paul-Albert Février, CNRS-Aix*Marseille Université (UMR 7297)

laurent.calvie@wanadoo.fr

Abstract

The Weil-Reinach edition of the *De musica* attributed to Plutarch is the result of a close collaboration of two among the best philologists and specialists of ancient Greek music active in France between the 19th and the 20th centuries : H. Weil and his pupil Th. Reinach. The latter (who personally provided the collation of the manuscripts, some of the exegetical notes and the index) put together the material, but it was Weil who should be regarded as primarily responsible for the work, whose overall organization and component parts are perfectly consistent with the principles and methods that he had already applied to his previous editions : the subordination of the criticism of the texts, founded on the recension of manuscripts, to their history and interpretation. The interventionism typical of this publication derives from the extremely ambitious target that Weil imposed on all his ecdotic works : the reconstruction not of the corrupt archetype of the extant Byzantine and Humanist manuscripts, but of the original condition of the ancient texts. Viewed in this light, the Weil-Reinach edition of the *De musica* is a treasure of erudition and intelligence, in which the textual problems of a text, which had been deeply altered since antiquity, are raised for the first time.

Keywords

archetype – conjectural criticism – textual criticism – ecdotics – hermeneutics – Plutarch – Reinach, Th. – Weil, H.

Malgré la publication postérieure de trois éditions critiques du *De musica* attribué à Plutarque, celle qu'en ont procurée Henri Weil (1818-1909) et Théodore Reinach (1860-1928) demeure, plus d'un siècle après sa parution en 1900, un

instrument de travail indispensable pour les philologues et les spécialistes de la musique antique : “à mes yeux”, écrit A. Bélis (2008, 166), “elle demeure la meilleure”.¹ Elle est en effet le fruit de l’étroite collaboration de deux savants d’exception, qui furent parmi les tout meilleurs spécialistes de la littérature et de la musique grecques à la charnière des 19^e et 20^e siècles, et qui pratiquaient la philologie classique de manière extrêmement intelligente. À la veille de sa parution, elle était ainsi attendue avec impatience par le prince des philologues allemands, U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1848-1931).² Ce dernier ne tenait cependant pas Th. Reinach en haute estime, mais il admirait H. Weil, “qui avait heureusement fait reflourir à Paris les études grecques” (1921, 62) ; ce “savant helléniste” (1929, 315) qui, pour ses 80 ans, avait reçu les hommages de “ses confrères, amis, élèves et admirateurs” français (A. et M. Croiset, P. Decharme, A. Hauvette, H. Lebègue, P. Masqueray, P. de Nolhac, H. Omont, A. Puech, etc.), allemands (F. Blass, O. Crusius, H. Diels, Th. Gomperz et U. von Wilamowitz), anglais (L. Campbell, R. C. Jebb, F. G. Kenyon et J. E. Sandys), grec (D. Sémitélos), hollandais (H. Van Herwerden), italien (D. Comparetti) et suisse (J. Nicole) ; “l’une des plus hautes personnalités des études helléniques”, dont le nom était devenu en 1908, “un symbole de ralliement pour tous ceux” qui, en France, considéraient “encore les lettres grecques comme le couronnement le plus beau et le plus noble de la culture intellectuelle” (Babelon 1908, 489).³ Le présent article, qui répond à une demande d’A. Barker et E. Rocconi, vise ainsi à préciser la part qu’a prise ce grand philologue dans l’élaboration de l’édition Weil-Reinach (1900) du *De musica* et la responsabilité qui lui incombe du caractère hautement conjectural de son texte : on y exposera donc successivement ce que l’on sait (1) de la collaboration des deux hommes, (2) de leur part respective dans ladite édition et (3) des principes ecdotiques de Weil, avant d’analyser sommairement (4) leur mise en pratique dans l’édition du *De musica*.

1 H. Weil et Th. Reinach

Le 7 novembre 1910, aux obsèques de Weil, Th. Reinach résumait en une formule laconique les relations qu’il avait successivement entretenues avec lui

1 Voir Ziegler 1953 ; Lasserre 1955 ; Einarson-De Lacy 1986.

2 Wilamowitz 1900, 4 : “Das aber kann nach dem Erscheinen der Ausgabe dieser Schrift von Weil und Reinach nicht mehr so kurz abgemacht werden [...], weil die Schrift erst gegen die Umformung verteidigt werden muss, der sie durch jene Gelehrte unterzogen worden ist”.

3 Voir Bollack 1995, 33 ; 1997, 63 et 384 ; Perrot 1910, 533 et 584 ; Weil 1898 ; 2014, 530 (fig. 51) ; Mahaffy 1899, 447.

en affirmant avoir été “élève, collaborateur, ami et finalement confrère” du défunt : tout cela est attesté par les rares documents dont on dispose encore aujourd’hui.⁴

Apprenti-philologue à Bonn (1835), Berlin (1836-1837) et Leipzig (1837-1838), sous la férule de F. G. Welcker, A. Böckh, F. Bopp et G. Hermann, Weil avait obtenu son doctorat allemand en 1838. Confronté à l’interdiction faite aux Juifs d’enseigner dans les universités d’Allemagne, il avait émigré en France en 1842, y avait été reçu docteur en 1845 et nommé professeur suppléant de littérature latine à la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg (1846-1849), avait obtenu l’agrégation (1848) et occupé le poste de professeur suppléant de littérature grecque et latine à la Faculté des Lettres de Besançon (1849-1876), avant d’être nommé, le 7 mars 1876, maître de conférences de langue et littérature grecques à l’École Normale Supérieure (ENS), en même temps que directeur d’études adjoint (pour le grec) à la section d’histoire et de philologie de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études (EPHE). Dans ces deux écoles prestigieuses, où il enseigna jusqu’à sa retraite (1891), il avait pour collègue un de ses anciens étudiants de Besançon, É. Tournier. À l’ENS, celui-ci dirigeait la conférence de grec de 1^{re} année, dévolue à “l’étude grammaticale des *éléments*” ; tandis qu’au maître revenaient les conférences de grec de 2^e et 3^e années, consacrées à l’étude de “l’histoire de la littérature” : Weil y exposait “alternativement, selon un cycle de deux ans, l’histoire de la poésie et l’histoire de la prose”.⁵ À la section “Philologie et Antiquités grecques” de l’EPHE, Tournier dirigeait les conférences d’“Explication et critique de textes”, où étaient aussi abordés les “éléments de la paléographie” ; tandis que Weil se chargeait “spécialement” de “l’histoire littéraire de la Grèce” et de la “métrique”, suivant un “cycle triennal” (poésie, prose, métrique).⁶

Or, durant les années universitaires 1877-1878 et 1878-1879, les conférences de littérature grecque de Weil à l’ENS (2^e, puis 3^e année) furent fréquentées par Salomon Reinach, qui avait intégré l’école en 1876. C’était le cadet des trois fils d’Hermann Reinach (“un banquier issu d’une famille israélite” du sud de Bâle qui “s’était installé en 1844 à Paris”), “les ‘Frères Je Sais Tout’, *J* comme Joseph, *S* comme Salomon, *T* comme Théodore” : récompensé à 16 reprises au Concours général, normalien à 18 ans, agrégé en 1879, membre de l’École française d’Athènes (1880-1882), puis (1896-1932) de l’Académie des inscriptions et

4 Voir Reinach 1909, 379 ; Calvié 2014, 18. Sur la perte des papiers de Th. Reinach, qui avaient été “dépôts chez son fils Léon”, “arrêté et mort en déportation”, voir Steve 2014, 10.

5 Voir Hummel 1994, 251-2 ; 1995, 95 et 98-104 ; Perrot 1910, 572-6 ; Calvié 2015, 462-6. Le Ms. 120 de la Bibliothèque des Lettres de l’ENS conserve les notes prises par G. Dalmeyda aux conférences de 1886-1888.

6 Voir Weil 1876, 4 ; 2014 (1876, 1879, 1881, 1882, 1885, 1887, 1889), 430-2 et 463-5.

Belles-Lettres (AIBL), il s'est en particulier illustré par la publications de plus de 8000 ouvrages et articles !⁷ S. Reinach paraît avoir particulièrement apprécié les cours et la personnalité de Weil à qui il a dédié les deux éditions de son *Manuel de philologie classique* (1882-1883 et 1907-1911) : "Témoignage de reconnaissance et d'affection". Son nom figure en outre parmi ceux des 11 auditeurs du premier "cours de métrique grecque" donné par Weil à l'EPHE (1878-1879), lequel fut aussi le premier "cours public" où l'on ait essayé "de traiter cette matière en France" en s'efforçant "d'aller du simple au complexe et de bien distinguer ce que nous savons, ce que nous entrevoyons, ce que nous ignorons"; et le nom de S. Reinach y figure juste au-dessous de celui de son benjamin, alors âgé de 17 ans à peine, Th. Reinach.⁸ C'est à cette occasion que Weil, alors presque sexagénaire, rencontra le jeune prodige qui venait de raffler 17 récompenses au Concours général, allait devenir avocat en 1881, docteur en droit en 1885 (et en lettres en 1890), puis être enfin élu à l'AIBL en 1909; quoi qu'on en ait dit, ce fut le seul cours de Weil auquel fût jamais inscrit Th. Reinach.⁹ Il dut revêtir pour ce dernier l'importance d'un *moment fondateur*, car dans l'avant-propos de *La musique grecque* (1926), daté du 24 janvier 1923, il affirmait avoir "passé plus de 40 ans de sa vie à étudier la métrique et la musique grecques" en usant d'une expression ('plus de 40 ans') qui pourrait bien renvoyer à l'époque où il assistait à ce cours.¹⁰

En 1884, six ans après son frère Salomon (1878), Th. Reinach rejoignit l'Association pour l'Encouragement des Études Grecques en France (AEEGF), dont Weil avait tour à tour été l'un des fondateurs (1867), le président (1881), l'un des membres de la Commission de publication (1881-1909) et du Comité (1886): il y devint rapidement l'un des piliers de la Commission archéologique (1887-1909) et y côtoya son ancien maître à la Commission de publication (1887-1909), laquelle avait en charge celle de l'*Annuaire* de l'association (1867-1887).¹¹ Dès 1888, ce dernier fut cependant remplacé par la *Revue des Études Grecques* (REG), dont Th. Reinach, devenu successivement "fondateur des Monuments grecs" (1888), membre du Comité de l'Association (1888, 1908, 1912 et 1926), Président (1907) et membre de sa Commission administrative (1908-1928), fut le "rédacteur en chef" et le "gérant" durant 19 ans (1888-1907):

7 Voir Reinach 2008, 15; Leclant 2008, 7s.

8 Voir Weil 1879b, 43s. S. Reinach (1907, 194) a reconnu devoir "beaucoup au *cours de métrique* professé par Weil aux Hautes-Études en 1878-79, cours resté malheureusement inédit".

9 Voir Cagnat 1931, 378; Leclant 2008, 10; Calvié 2014, 18, 29.

10 Reinach 1926, 5.

11 Voir Croiset 1887, x-xvi, xxiv et xlviii et Perrot 1910, 579s.

il en rédigea régulièrement la “Chronique” (1888-1907), le “Bulletin archéologique” (1889-1890), puis le “Bulletin épigraphique” (1891-1904), et y publia 576 articles, chroniques et comptes-rendus (1888-1928) ; tandis que le vieux Weil y donnait 44 articles et révisions (1888-1909).¹² Malgré cette collaboration administrative, Reinach demeurait avant tout l'élève de ce dernier : lorsque, en 1892, il publia, avec E. d'Eichthal, le premier article à témoigner de sa compétence en musique antique, une note liminaire précisait qu'une fois leur “travail achevé, M. H. Weil” avait “bien voulu revoir avec” eux “quelques problèmes” et les “faire bénéficier de ses précieuses observations”.¹³ La collaboration scientifique des deux hommes ne débuta proprement qu'en 1893. Cette année-là, la *REG* publia en effet un compte-rendu des trois premiers fascicules des *Papyrus de Berlin* (1892) co-signés par les deux savants ; et le *BCH* un article où Weil affirmait avoir prié Reinach “d'étudier la musique” des “nouveaux fragments d'hymnes” découverts à Delphes et ajoutait que cet helléniste “musicien” savait “de la musique des anciens autant qu'il nous est donné d'en savoir” (p. 570 [= 1902, 54] et 583) : de fait, la contribution de Weil à la restitution textuelle du premier hymne delphique à Apollon y était suivie de l'article de Reinach intitulé “La musique des hymnes de Delphes” ; et en 1894, le même *BCH* offrait sa restitution musicale du second hymne delphique à Apollon juste après l'étude de son texte procurée par Weil.¹⁴ C'est ainsi que les noms des deux hommes figurent, aux côtés de celui du musicien G. Fauré, dans les différentes éditions de la partition de l'*Hymne à Apollon* ; et même “dans le très populaire Almanach Hachette de l'année 1895”.¹⁵ Il convient toutefois de préciser que leur collaboration à la restitution du second hymne delphique à Apollon ne fut nullement de la même nature que la première. En 1893, Weil ne mentionnait que deux fois le nom de Reinach ; quant à ce dernier, qui proposait une ‘division périodique’ dont son collaborateur n'avait pu bénéficier, il affirmait que Weil avait signalé “un changement bien marqué dans l'allure de la poésie”, alors même qu'il “ignorait les résultats de l'analyse musicale” et que lui-même n'avait pu “profiter des derniers changements apportés” par Weil “à la restitution du début du poème”.¹⁶ Tout cela suggère que l'un et l'autre avaient travaillé séparément et de manière décalée à leurs tâches respectives. De même, le compte rendu publié la même année dans la *REG*, où il est présenté comme une collaboration

12 Voir Reinach 1888, xxxv, xxxvii, 108-126 ; Glotz-Reinach 1909, 398-400 ; Glotz 1928, 323 et 325.

13 D'Eichthal-Reinach 1892, 22, 41 et 50.

14 Voir Reinach-Weil 1893, 140 ; Reinach 1893 et 1894 ; Weil 1893, 570 et 583 ; et 1894.

15 Voir Fauré-Weil-Reinach 1894 ; Weil 2014, 328, fig. 28 ; Bélis 2008, 172 et 174.

16 Reinach 1893, 585, 595s. n. 4 et 602.

des deux hommes, est en fait rédigé par le seul Reinach, qui y a juste reproduit une liste d'interventions textuelles de Weil ainsi introduite : "Notre savant collaborateur veut bien nous communiquer les corrections ou conjectures suivantes au travail de Wilcken".¹⁷ En 1894, Weil mentionne en revanche 5 fois le nom de celui qui est devenu un véritable collaborateur et à qui il "lit des morceaux" de l'hymne.¹⁸

Cette collaboration active fut assurément l'occasion ou l'effet d'un rapprochement des deux savants : dans le *Journal des débats* du 17 octobre 1894, Weil appelle ainsi son collaborateur "mon jeune ami".¹⁹ De cette amitié naissante témoignent aussi le très bienveillant compte rendu donné par Weil des *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaïsme* (1895) rassemblés et édités par Reinach, qui y est appelé un "savant et infatigable écrivain" (pp. 326s.) ; et l'article offert par le disciple à son ancien maître dans le recueil publié à l'occasion de son 80^e anniversaire (1898), dont voici les derniers mots : "puisse-t-il trouver dans ces pages un témoignage nouveau de mon profond respect pour le savant, de mon affectueuse reconnaissance pour le maître et l'ami" (p. 422).²⁰ C'est donc dans le cadre de cette collaboration amicale qu'il faut situer l'édition Weil-Reinach du *De la musique* (1900). Le 12 février 1909, Reinach devenait enfin le confrère de son maître, collaborateur et ami par son élection comme "membre libre" de l'AI BL, "en remplacement de M. Hamy, décédé", avec "23 suffrages" : il y était installé le "26 février" suivant par un décret du 17.²¹ Six mois plus tard, aux obsèques de Weil (7 novembre 1909), le jeune académicien réaffirmait une dernière fois, au nom de l'AE EGF, tout ce qu'il devait à son défunt confrère, en qui il avait découvert "cette divination du philologue qui ne s'acquiert pas, qui est véritablement un don de la nature" (1909, 380) ; et, avec l'historien G. Glotz, un autre des élèves du maître, il mit rapidement au point sa "Bibliographie scientifique", dont la section "II. Éditions et traductions" s'achève sur le titre suivant : "Plutarque. De la musique (Περὶ

17 Reinach-Weil 1893, 140.

18 Reinach 1894, 349, 353, 356 : "Reinach, s'étant aperçu des traces d'un X, m'a proposé le supplément ci-dessus" ; "le déchiffrement, longtemps douteux, n'a été définitivement établi que grâce à l'estampage", où Reinach "reconnut la trace d'un X et le verbe ἵαχεμ" ; "Reinach me propose d'insérer ici le fragment b" ; "supplément proposé" par Reinach, "après avoir remarqué la trace de la petite barre oblique inférieure du Σ" ; et surtout "quand je lisais ce morceau" à Reinach, "il me proposa" d'y "introduire ἦν ('voici')".

19 Weil 2014 (1894), 327 : "Mon jeune ami, qui est à la fois helléniste et musicien, étudie en ce moment les signes interlinéaires [...]. La sagacité de M. Reinach tirera certainement de cette notation fragmentaire tout le parti qu'il est possible d'en tirer".

20 Voir aussi Hemmerdinger 1972, 97.

21 Voir Bouché-Leclercq 1909, 119 et 182s.

Μουσικής). Édition critique, avec traduction, notes et introduction. En collaboration avec Th. Reinach. Paris, E. Leroux, 1900. In-8^o.²²

2 Le partage des tâches entre les deux collaborateurs

On n'a malheureusement conservé aucun document relatif à l'élaboration par Weil et Reinach de cette édition. L'essentiel de ce que l'on en sait est contenu dans la fin d'une allocution de Weil à l'AIBL (18 mai 1900) : "Je tiens à dire que, dans ce travail commun, le gros de la besogne a été fait par M. Reinach. C'est lui qui s'est chargé de tout rédiger, et pour ce qui est des questions de musique, je ne dis pas de rythmique et de métrique, mais de musique proprement dite, sa compétence est beaucoup plus grande que la mienne. Aussi son nom devrait-il figurer avant le mien sur le titre" (1900b, 31) ; dans le dernier paragraphe de l'introduction du volume : "Nous lui [à la critique] livrons l'œuvre de trois années avec la conscience de n'y avoir épargné ni le temps ni la peine" (Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXVIII) ; et dans les trois lignes imprimées au bas de sa table des matières : "La constitution du texte est l'œuvre commune des deux collaborateurs. La traduction, les notes critiques et explicatives, l'introduction, l'appendice et l'index ont été rédigés par Th. Reinach" (p. 179). Par chance, le volume présente un certain nombre d'indications qui, jointes à ce que l'on sait des pratiques philologiques de Weil, permettent de préciser le rôle des deux collaborateurs dans la réalisation de cette édition.

Les deux phrases par lesquelles Reinach précise les tâches imparties à chacun d'entre eux méritent d'être lues avec attention et analysées avec précision. Si elles forment en effet une antithèse et opposent ainsi "l'œuvre commune des deux collaborateurs" au travail du seul Reinach, cette antithèse est bancale, car ce qui y est opposé n'est pas de la même nature : on a, d'un côté, 'la constitution du texte', non sa *copie* et la *rédaction de son apparat critique* ; et, de l'autre, la 'rédaction' de 'la traduction', des 'notes critiques et explicatives', de son 'introduction', de l'appendice' de celle-ci et de l'index', non leur *conception* et leur *élaboration*. Autrement dit, il faut se garder d'attribuer l'établissement du texte aux deux collaborateurs et le reste au seul Reinach, ainsi que l'ont par exemple fait C. Johnson et H. Gleditsch : les deux collaborateurs ont dû élaborer ensemble l'introduction, ses appendices, la traduction et les notes ("ce travail commun", dit Weil) ; mais c'est Reinach qui a seul tenu la plume, a ainsi fait office de secrétaire et a mis le tout en forme et au net ('rédigé', dit Reinach, et 'tout rédiger', confirme Weil) ; quant au texte grec, il a dû être consti-

22 Voir Calvié 2014, 18 ; Weil 1880, 5 ; Glotz-Reinach 1909, 385.

tué à partir d'un exemplaire de l'édition Volkmann, auquel ils auront apporté ensemble les modifications résultant de leurs choix ecdotiques communs.²³ La seule conclusion directe que l'on puisse tirer de ces deux phrases est donc que si le texte grec et les notes critiques sont l'œuvre commune des deux savants, l'«Index des noms propres et des termes musicaux», qui ne saurait avoir d'existence en dehors de sa 'rédaction', appartient au seul Reinach.

Alors que le nom de Weil n'apparaît nulle part ailleurs dans le volume que sur sa page de titre, celui de son disciple figure non seulement sur celle-ci et au bas de la table des matières, mais également au terme de l'introduction (signature), dans deux notes de bas de page qui se réfèrent à ses publications personnelles, en tête des «Addenda et corrigenda» et, à huit reprises, dans la première section de l'appendice de l'introduction, où Reinach indique avoir lui-même collationné dix manuscrits du dialogue.²⁴ Or il est absolument certain que Weil n'a pris aucune part à ces collations (pas même à celle des manuscrits parisiens), car, dès 1881, il avait la vue trop basse pour lire des *codices* médiévaux.²⁵ Les dix collations nouvelles sur lesquelles repose l'édition Weil-Reinach doivent donc toutes être attribuées à Reinach. À Paris, ce dernier a pu bénéficier du concours bienveillant d'H. Omont, alors «conservateur du Département des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale», qui venait de donner une contribution aux *Mélanges H. Weil* :²⁶ Reinach signale ainsi par deux fois que des renseignements sur les manuscrits parisiens lui ont été «communiqués par H. Omont».²⁷ Quant aux manuscrits italiens, il a dû collationner les uns (F², F³, R¹ et R³) «en octobre 1899», comme il l'a indiqué en tête des «Addenda et corrigenda» du *De la musique* ; et il a peut-être étudié V¹ lors du voyage en Italie, fait au printemps 1896, au cours duquel il avait également collationné le f. 33 du *Vat. Reg.* 108 ; mais il peut aussi l'avoir collationné plus tard : il avait des cousins chez qui loger à Rome, d'où il lui était loisible d'aller à Venise.²⁸

On aurait en revanche tort d'attribuer à Reinach la paternité exclusive de l'excellente traduction en français qui accompagne le texte grec du *De musica* en arguant que le français n'était pas la langue maternelle de Weil. Celui-ci

23 Voir Volkmann 1856 ; Johnson 1900, 332 ; Gleditsch 1901, 707.

24 Weil-Reinach 1900, 122, 125, 165 et XXXIX-XLIV.

25 Voir Weil 1884, 13 ; 1910, x ; 2014 (1896), 361 ; Graux 1881, 9 ; Lavisie 1884, xxxi ; Perrot 1910, 581 ; Hummel 1995, 159 ; Calvié 2014, 46.

26 Voir Omont 1898 et 1933, IX.

27 Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXIX et XL.

28 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, 165 ; Reinach 1896, 188 : «J'ai collationné ce feuillet au Vatican, au mois d'avril dernier» ; et Geffroy 1880, 16 ; Duchêne 1996, 275 ; Mulliez 2008, 45 ; et Reinach 2008, 16.

avait en effet un “sentiment très juste et très vif des exigences et des finesses de la langue française” et il écrivait “le français avec une propriété de termes et avec une élégance que pouvaient lui envier beaucoup de ceux qui, parmi nos compatriotes, font métier d'écrivain” : il l'avait sans doute appris, dans sa petite enfance, de son père (Jakob), qui dirigeait une *Jüdische Realschule* à Francfort et y enseignait précisément le français.²⁹ Son premier livre, intitulé *Das klassische Alterthum für Deutschlands Jugend* (1843), consistait d'autre part en un recueil de traductions en allemand de textes choisis d'auteurs grecs et latins ; et l'on a émis l'hypothèse que l'intense pratique de la traduction supposée par la préparation de ce volume avait été à l'origine de sa thèse française *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes* (1844).³⁰ Quoi qu'il en soit, chaque fois que Weil a publié un texte épigraphique ou papyrologique récemment découvert, il en a accompagné l'édition d'une version française tout à la fois claire, précise et élégante :³¹ c'est ainsi que, lorsqu'il collabora avec Th. Reinach à l'édition des *Hymnes de Delphes*, celui-ci ne participa nullement à l'élaboration de la traduction et que Weil en assumait seul la responsabilité. Il est bien entendu impossible de faire le départ entre ce qui, dans celle du *De la Musique*, revient à chacun des deux collaborateurs, mais il convient de souligner que *ποίησις* et *ποίημα* y sont en général rendus par ‘composition’, *ποιεῖν* par ‘composer’ et *ποιητής* par ‘compositeur’, comme y invitait un fameux article de Weil.³² Si la traduction du *De la Musique* a indubitablement été mise au net par Reinach, elle doit ainsi être le fruit de la collaboration du maître et du disciple.

De même que, dans les notes critiques, le rédacteur a pris soin de n'employer que des premières personnes du pluriel (‘nous’) pour désigner les interventions que son collaborateur et lui-même avaient imposées au texte

29 Perrot 1910, 533 et 579 ; voir aussi Monod 1909, 378 ; Samuel 2008, 3.

30 Voir Perrot 1910, 552.

31 Voir par exemple Weil 2014 (1891, 1894, 1896, 1898, 1899, 1900 et 1901), 308, 318, 325, 365, 373, 380, 390, 400, 405, 409, 412, etc.

32 Weil 2014 (1884), 229 : “à la différence des poètes, les prosateurs s'appelaient *συγγραφείς*, écrivains [...]. Les odes de Pindare, les drames de Sophocle et d'Aristophane, en général les œuvres poétiques, étaient composés pour être exécutés publiquement par des chanteurs, des danseurs, des acteurs. On distinguait les interprètes qui exécutaient l'œuvre de celui qui l'avait composée et qu'on appelait *ποιητής*. De notre temps [...], comme le nom de musicien convient à ceux qui exécutent une œuvre musicale aussi bien qu'à celui qui l'a conçue, on distingue ce dernier par le nom de *compositeur*. Ce mot, qui a un sens plus général, mais qui s'applique chez nous particulièrement aux auteurs de musique, offre la plus grande analogie avec le *ποιητής* des Grecs” ; voir aussi Weil-Reinach 1900, 11, 15, 17, 21, 43, 73, 121, 139, 141, 175s., etc.

des manuscrits, de même il s'est bien gardé d'employer le pronom de première personne du singulier ('je') non seulement dans la table des "Signes conventionnels et abréviations", l'"Appendice C" et les "Addenda et corrigenda", où il se désigne par son nom, mais également dans l'introduction du volume, où le 'nous' souligne partout la dimension *commune* du projet et de sa réalisation.³³ On peut même inférer de la très bonne connaissance que Weil avait de l'œuvre de Plutarque et de l'intérêt tout particulier qu'il manifestait vers 1900 pour les questions d'authenticité et d'attribution, que c'est lui qui est à l'origine de la troisième section de l'introduction ("Attribution du dialogue") et de l'appendice ("Loci Plutarchi de musica"). De la maîtrise dans la recherche des sources (*Quellenforschung*) dont il avait fait preuve dans le compte-rendu du *System der antiken Rhythmik* (1865) de R. Westphal, on peut également conclure qu'il n'était nullement étranger à la deuxième section de l'introduction ("Des sources du *De Musica*"). Quant à ses sections 1 et 4 ("De la composition du *De Musica*" et "Des manuscrits et de l'état du texte"), il doit également avoir pris une grande part à leur élaboration, car elles ont leur équivalent dans toutes ses précédentes éditions, où sont toujours étudiées la composition de l'ouvrage, qui offre une interprétation d'ensemble dans laquelle s'inscrivent les explications de détail données dans les notes exégétiques, et la présentation des manuscrits et de "l'état du texte", qui est partie prenante d'une véritable histoire du texte (avec revue de ses éditions imprimées) et préside à son établissement et à son annotation critique.³⁴

-
- 33 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXVIII : "nous en avons dit assez pour faire apprécier au lecteur à la fois l'intérêt et la difficulté de la tâche que nous avons entreprise ; ce sont là deux titres à la bienveillance, nous dirons même volontiers à l'indulgence de la critique. Nous lui livrons l'œuvre de trois années [...] ; à elle de juger [...] si le *Dialogue sur la Musique* sort de nos mains amélioré dans quelques-unes de ses parties et éclairé dans quelques autres : c'est à ce résultat que s'est borné notre ambition" ; et I "il nous a semblé" ; LIII, n. 1 "notre collection est plus complète que celle de Burette ; cependant nous n'avons pas cru devoir [...] ; nous offrons au lecteur" ; LXXIS. : "nous retranchons", "nous insérons", "nous avons transposé" ; et 3, 6, 8, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 28, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 48, 52, 56, 60, 62, 64, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76, etc. : *correximus, transposuimus, addidimus, inclusimus, inseruimus, indicavimus, restituimus, malimus* ; 165 : "la collation des manuscrits F2, F3, R1, R3 faite par Th. Reinach" ; et 165-7 : "nous croyons", "nous retirons", "nous nous rallions", "nous aurions dû".
- 34 Voir Weil s.d., 323-55 et en particulier 329, où, sous le titre "Authenticité", figurent une listes de références bibliographiques (précédée de la mention "Indice. Plutarque a évité l'hiatus, dans certains cas déterminés") et une analyse de l'ouvrage de G. Benseler auquel se réfère une note de l'édition du dialogue (Weil-Reinach 1900, XXIV, 1). Pour le reste, voir Weil 1902, 163-72 ; et 2014 (1894, 1895, 1899 et 1901), 331-9, 387-98 et 409-13.

Dans le premier appendice, le rédacteur se désigne généralement aussi par son nom et associe son collaborateur à la description des manuscrits du dialogue en employant parfois le pluriel 'nous' pour renvoyer à leur commune activité ecdotique.³⁵ Ce faisant, il souligne cependant le rôle prépondérant qu'il a joué dans l'étude des manuscrits en se désolidarisant de Weil par l'usage du pronom singulier : "J'ai constaté de remarquables concordances [de R³] avec V¹ (par exemple § 305, vers 9)".³⁶ Il procède de même dans le deuxième appendice, où il renvoie au texte de l'édition par l'expression "jusqu'à notre § 104" et où il se réfère trois fois encore à sa collaboration avec Weil en usant du pluriel 'nous', mais où il paraît souligner son apport personnel par l'emploi de cinq premières personnes du singulier : à y regarder de plus près, ce dernier usage vise cependant toujours à dédouaner son collaborateur des insuffisances de leur travail commun ; la formule latine *non vidi*, qui figure trois fois dans le passage, et l'expression "je ne sais si cette collection comprend le *De Mus.*" imputent ainsi à Reinach seul le tort de 'ne pas avoir vu' quatre anciennes éditions de Plutarque ; quant à la remarque "c'est à ma connaissance le premier doute exprimé sur l'authenticité du traité", elle fait de son rédacteur le seul responsable de son éventuelle ignorance.³⁷ Les pronoms de première personne du singulier ('je') ne sont enfin nulle part aussi nombreux que dans le commentaire exégétique, où l'on en compte pas moins de quatorze.³⁸ On aurait pourtant tort d'en inférer que le vieux maître en ait abandonné l'élaboration à son disciple, car cette forme y demeure tout de même beaucoup plus rare que celle du pluriel ('nous') ; et dans sept de ses occurrences, elle a en outre été corrigée dans les "Addenda et corrigenda", où elle a été remplacée par le pluriel.³⁹ Il se peut que les sept autres 'je' aient été conservés pour souligner le caractère personnel des notes du commentaire exégétique dans lesquelles ils figurent, car ces notes relèvent généralement de l'érudition juridique et musicale, qui sont les seuls domaines (avec la numismatique) dans lequel le disciple avait surpassé le maître : elles concernent ainsi le sens du mot *κρούματα*, les témoignages anciens sur les compositions musicales de Linos,

35 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXIX-XLIV : "collationné par Th. Reinach" ; et XLVI : "nous citons".

36 Weil-Reinach 1900, XLIV.

37 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, XLVII-LII : "nous citerons", "nous les avons reproduites" et "nous rangeons".

38 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, 8, 11, 25, 28, 45, 49, 50, 56, 67, 69, 72, 108, 114 et 117.

39 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, 28, 49, 50, 56, 72, 114 et 117 ; et 166 : "§ 70. NE. Lire [l. 4] : *Nous ne croyons pas*" [au lieu de "je ne crois pas"] ; "P. 49. NE. dernière l. Lire : *nous le montrerons* [au lieu de "je le montrerai"]", etc.

l'acception juridique du mot *γραφή*, l'ancienne nomenclature des systèmes harmoniques, l'époque de Lamproclès et Agathoclès, le poème nommé *ἐπωιδόν* et un témoignage d'Olympiodore sur la formation musicale de Platon.⁴⁰ Mais, comme il n'y a là rien d'absolument inaccessible à Weil, il se peut aussi que ces 'singuliers' aient simplement échappé au relecteur des épreuves. Quoi qu'il en soit, ces sept 'je' subsistants (tout comme les sept qui ont été corrigés) manifestent clairement que le rédacteur se sentait plus libre dans les notes exégétiques, dont nul n'a jamais mis en doute la haute valeur, que dans l'introduction ou les notes critiques : sans doute Weil, reconnaissant la supériorité de son disciple en ce domaine, l'y avait-il engagé.⁴¹

Au terme de cette revue, on peut donc considérer que l'édition Weil-Reinach est le fruit d'une véritable collaboration littéraire et scientifique : si Reinach s'est chargé seul de la collation de dix manuscrits, de l'établissement de l'index et de l'ensemble de la mise au net du volume, son introduction et son appendice, son texte grec, sa traduction, ses notes critiques et exégétiques, ses "Addenda et corrigenda" et sa table des matières sont assurément l'œuvre commune des deux collaborateurs. Même si le rédacteur a sans doute pris une part prépondérante dans l'établissement des deux premières sections de l'appendice et dans la mise au point des notes exégétiques, on aurait tort de voir en lui le maître d'œuvre de cette édition, car celle-ci est en tout point conforme à la méthode ecdotique élaborée durant un demi-siècle par Weil, à qui Reinach doit surtout avoir servi de secrétaire, d'auxiliaire philologique (paléographie et critique) et de conseiller musical. Jusqu'à la mort de son ancien maître, ce dernier s'est toujours senti son humble disciple : en 1898, il affirmait ainsi s'être fait "une loi de ne rien publier sur des choses grecques sans avoir sollicité l'avis de ce juge si sûr et si bienveillant" et n'avoir pu se résoudre alors à se "passer tout à fait de son *imprimatur*" ; en 1904, il estimait encore que "l'éloge des admirables éditions" de Weil n'était "plus à faire" ; et, en 1910, il rendait un dernier hommage au 'divin' philologue : "Que de fois j'ai, pour ma part, franchi son seuil hospitalier pour apporter au vieux maître la primeur d'une inscription ou d'un papyrus, pour demander son avis sur un texte difficile! Toujours on rencontrait le même accueil affable et courtois, la même sûreté de savoir et de goût, la même finesse déliée, prompte à saisir le fort et le faible d'un argument, la même impeccable mémoire servie par la même divination".⁴²

40 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, 8, 11, 25, 45, 67, 69 et 108.

41 Voir Weil 1900b, 311, cité ci-devant (n. 23).

42 Reinach 1898, 422 ; 1904 ; et 1909, 380.

3 Les principes ecdotiques d'Henri Weil

La méthode ecdotique employée dans l'édition Weil-Reinach est, *mutatis mutandis*, celle que Weil a élaborée et mise en pratique, à partir de 1858, dans ses éditions d'Eschyle, d'Euripide, de Démosthène, de Denys d'Halicarnasse et de nombreux textes épigraphiques et papyrologiques :⁴³ elle repose sur des principes originaux qui méritent d'être explicités tout d'abord ; et elle suppose un dispositif ecdotique qu'il convient de présenter ensuite.

Weil regardait la littérature antique comme un champ de ruines. Face au texte inédit du second hymne de Delphes, il regrettait ainsi, en 1894, qu'il ne présente "pas une seule ligne à laquelle il ne manque plus ou moins de mots" : entre les morceaux de pierre et les manuscrits médiévaux, il ne voyait qu'une différence de *degré de corruption*, car tous les textes anciens ont souffert, durant leur longue histoire, d'"altérations voulues ou inconscientes", que ce soit celui des rares tragédies d'Eschyle, des discours de Démosthène, "tant étudiés dans les écoles des rhéteurs" et ainsi "tant copié", ou le texte "extrêmement corrompu" du plus confidentiel dialogue *De la Musique*, qui présenterait "un véritable répertoire de toutes les altérations paléographiques".⁴⁴ Confronté à la corruption généralisée des textes antiques, Weil considérait que la tâche première du philologue était de les restaurer dans leur splendeur originelle.⁴⁵ Confiant dans les ressources de l'esprit humain et la valeur du jugement critique, il estimait que c'était en général possible : un texte ancien étant l'ouvrage cohérent d'un auteur intelligent d'une époque donnée, il a été rédigé suivant certaines normes littéraires, linguistiques et stylistiques ; celui qui a étudié la langue et la littérature grecques, qui connaît l'histoire des textes et a pratiqué la paléographie et la critique textuelle, devrait donc être capable d'établir un diagnostic exact sur l'état du texte et d'y remédier.⁴⁶ Weil était cependant conscient de la différence fondamentale séparant la mutilation effective des inscriptions et

43 Voir Glotz-Reinach 1909, 384-5 ; et Weil 1858-67 ; 1868 ; 1873 ; 1877 ; 1878 ; 1879 ; 1881 ; 1883 ; 1884b ; 1886 ; 1891 ; 1905 ; 1907 ; 1910 ; et 2014, 433-6, 441-6, 468-81, 508-12 et 523-30.

44 Voir Weil 1858, VI ; 1873, XLV ; et 2014 (1866 et 1894), 151 et 324.

45 Weil 2014 (1866), 151 : "toutes les fois que, depuis la Renaissance, on a fait une bonne édition [...], on a enlevé quelques taches, on a réparé quelques injures faites à un chef-d'œuvre de l'antiquité".

46 Weil 2014 (1894), 324 : "la restitution du morceau est loin d'être une entreprise chimérique, ni même aventureuse. On accorde bien à l'architecte le droit de reconstruire un temple, une église, un palais, d'après les ruines qui en subsistent [...]. Il n'en va pas autrement des monuments littéraires. Souvent un tronçon de phrase laisse deviner la phrase tout entière ; un pan conservé de la pensée en indique la direction et la suite ; une conjonction, une particule implique la tournure d'une période".

des papyrus de la corruption supposée de la tradition manuscrite : la première est attestée par des accidents matériels concrets (manques, brisures, déchirures, etc.) et est donc constatable *de visu* ; tandis que la seconde consiste le plus souvent en une supputation subjective, due à l'insatisfaction éprouvée par le philologue lui-même face au décalage entre l'idée que l'ancienne tradition philologique donne d'un auteur, de sa langue ou de ses œuvres et l'état des textes transmis par les manuscrits médiévaux. C'est pourquoi il estimait que "le premier point", et "peut-être le plus important" était de s'assurer que le texte avait "reçu quelque atteinte".⁴⁷ Or, cherchant à lire la littérature grecque avec les yeux des Grecs anciens et à entendre leur langue et leur musique avec leurs oreilles, il accordait une grande importance à leur jugement et à leur tradition littéraire : sa confiance en celle-ci est à l'origine de son étude approfondie de leurs écrits grammaticaux et musicaux, de sa défense des théories rythmiques rapportées par Aristide Quintilien et de "l'authenticité et l'âge" des élégies de Tyrtée.⁴⁸ C'est ainsi qu'avec Reinach, il a également soutenu, sur "le témoignage unanime des manuscrits", l'"attribution traditionnelle" du *De Musica* à Plutarque et y a trouvé l'une de ses œuvres de jeunesse.⁴⁹

L'intérêt de Weil pour la tradition philologique des anciens va de pair avec la conscience aiguë qu'il avait de la nature de production historique de leurs

47 Weil 2014 (1868), 195.

48 Voir Weil 1902, 164-9 ; et 2014 (1855, 1899, 1862, 1865, 1867, 1872, 1875, 1884, 1889, 1893, 1895 et 1897), 127-30, 387-98 et 446-65 ; et Calvié 2014, 30-4, 52-6 : aux références qui y sont données, il faut ajouter le Ms. 118 de la Bibliothèque de l'ENS Ulm-Lettres (Paris), qui contient le brouillon de l'*Histoire de la versification grecque et latine* (1852) de Weil.

49 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXI et XXXI ; et Johnson 1900, 332. Contrairement à ce que laissent entendre G. Amsel (1887, 125), E. Mioni (1960, 13) et Th. J. Mathiesen (1988, 788), on sait aujourd'hui (voir Cannata Fera 2011, 203, 6) que le dialogue n'est pas anépigraphe dans V (V¹), où la lampe de Wood révèle (en haut du f. 61) les traces du nom Πλουτάρχου. Dans Reinach 1898b, 403-5, le fragment rythmique du *P.Oxy.* 9 est semblablement attribué au *jeune* Aristoxène ; Weil avait en revanche tout d'abord admis l'hypothèse de Westphal (1866, 32-3) que le "*De Musica* est une compilation, sans originalité" et qu'on "pourrait l'attribuer au fils homonyme de Plutarque" (Weil s.d., 331). Voir aussi Weil s.d., 341 : "L'authenticité [du *De malignitate* de Plutarque] a été soutenue contre les doutes exprimés par plusieurs savants par Lahmeyer : *De libelli Plutarchaei ... et auctoritate et auctore*, Gottingae, 1848 et par L. Holzapfel dans *Philologus* B. XLVII (1882), 235sq. Après avoir réfuté les arguments contraires, il donne la preuve directe de l'authenticité en montrant que Plutarque dans ses *Vies* s'accorde pour un grand nombre de fautes d'appréciations historiques avec le traité en question, et que, s'il lui arrive de mentionner des faits rapportés par Hérodote et contestés dans le traité, il ne le fait qu'en dégageant sa propre responsabilité par un renvoi à Hérodote".

écrits, de l'historicité de leur texte et de leur transmission.⁵⁰ Les considérations sur l'histoire du texte du *De musica* sont ainsi omniprésentes dans l'introduction de l'édition Weil-Reinach, qui la fait remonter jusqu'aux livres que son auteur aurait eu "sous les yeux".⁵¹ L'ecdotique de Weil est ainsi subordonnée à l'histoire des textes, qui est indispensable pour "bien établir la méthode à suivre pour la recension du texte" à éditer et au nom de laquelle le texte des plus anciens manuscrits lui-même peut être remis en question : "il faut, la plupart du temps, mettre l'auteur hors de cause et s'en prendre aux copistes ou aux éditeurs".⁵² Les papyrus et parchemins "retirés du sol de l'Égypte" lui avait en effet appris que, dans les textes antiques, la corruption était presque partout ancienne ; il en avait conclu que "l'autorité de tous les manuscrits réunis n'est pas une garantie absolue de la bonté du texte et doit quelquefois céder à des conjectures légitimes" ; et c'est en vertu d'un tel constat que Weil et Reinach affirmaient qu'il "restait beaucoup à faire" pour "améliorer le texte, misérablement corrompu", du *De musica*.⁵³ Tel que l'a décrit Wilamowitz, le projet d'ensemble qui préside à leur édition est donc parfaitement conforme à la tâche impartie par Weil à l'éditeur de textes anciens, laquelle consiste à *défendre* "l'ouvrage accusé d'être informe" en lui rendant sa forme originelle : les deux collaborateurs n'ont ainsi pas hésité à y supposer "une interversion de feuillets du Codex archétype", mais aussi "des *adscripta-transposita*" de copistes antérieurs ou "des additions du manuscrit original de Plutarque" insérés "un peu au hasard dans le texte" ; et à y remédier, conformément à l'idée que la tradition leur avait transmise de Plutarque.⁵⁴ Ce faisant, ils ont appliqué deux principes critiques d'une grande modernité épistémologique : le *principe d'intelligibilité*, qui consiste à n'éditer aucune leçon dont on ne soit en mesure de proposer une interprétation grammaticale et sémantique, et le *principe d'explicabilité*, qui impose d'expliquer l'origine de la faute que l'on corrige en montrant que cette faute présuppose la correction que l'on propose.⁵⁵

50 Sur l'histoire du texte d'Homère, Hésiode, Eschyle, Aristophane, Euripide et Ménandre, voir Weil 1862 ; 1887 ; 1892 ; 1894b ; et 2014 (1868, 1875, 1877, 1888, 1908, 1890, 1869 et 1872), 181-91, 209-13, 215-7, 277-92, 418, 479, 483 et 505.

51 Weil-Reinach 1900, IV-XXIII, XXVIII-XXIX, XXXI, XXXII-XXXVIII (et XXXVII).

52 Weil 2014 (1866 et 1890), 151 et 479 ; voir aussi Weil 1900, 319.

53 Voir Weil 1900, 319 ; et Weil-Reinach 1900, I.

54 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXVI-XXXVII : "Nous n'avons pas cru cependant devoir reculer devant un certain nombre de changements de ce genre, sans lesquels la suite des idées nous paraissait totalement brouillée ; il nous eût paru injurieux pour la mémoire de Plutarque de lui attribuer, même à ses débuts littéraires, une pareille incohérence" ; et Wilamowitz 1900, 4, cité ci-devant (n. 2).

55 Voir Dain 1975, 173 ; et Havet 1911, 109.

On a accusé Weil d'avoir souffert de "conjecturite aiguë" et de s'être autorisé à "corriger les leçons des manuscrits", même quand ceux-ci étaient d'accord.⁵⁶ S'il a tout d'abord apporté une foule de corrections plus ou moins nécessaires au texte des poètes grecs, il en est cependant revenu par la suite et a même fini par regretter ("J'ai trop osé") l'interventionnisme "de son premier Eschyle", par trouver un "sens fort raisonnable" dans les manuscrits, là où il avait d'abord "cru devoir s'en écarter", et par reprocher à ses confrères de corriger par des "conjectures aventureuses" les textes qu'ils ne comprenaient pas ou de "suppléer à notre ignorance par des fictions arbitraires".⁵⁷ À partir des années 1860, il s'est mis à "défendre le texte traditionnel contre les témérités d'une critique imprudente", puis à soutenir la priorité de la compréhension sur la correction (*plus interpretationis eget quam emendationis*), à privilégier les interventions bénignes et à critiquer les éditeurs plus audacieux : en 1888 et en 1894, il dénonçait ainsi les atteintes aux leçons manuscrites heurtant la sensibilité moderne ; en 1890, il critiquait la conformation des textes littéraires à la langue "des inscriptions" ; en 1896, il renonçait à corriger un texte corrompu d'Alcman pour éviter de lui imposer une correction manquant de 'probabilité' ; et en 1897, il brocardait Tournier et A. Desrousseaux d'avoir corrigé un vers de l'*Odyssée* dont le "texte traditionnel" pouvait s'expliquer.⁵⁸ En outre, Weil se défait tout autant du *mécanicisme scientifique* que de la *critique subjective*. Ayant érigé "la rigueur scientifique" en idéal, il tenait le plus grand compte de la bibliographie, ancienne et récente, ainsi que des progrès de la recherche philologique : à ses yeux, les manuscrits devaient "être le point de départ de toute bonne critique" ; et il a tant et si bien contribué à la diffusion en France des nouvelles méthodes critiques allemandes que l'on a pu le considérer comme le père spirituel de la collection *Budé*.⁵⁹ Il se refusait cependant à employer lesdites méthodes pour

56 Voir Bollack 1997, 71-3 ; et 2013, 724 ; Perrot 1910, 567 ; Tournier 1866, 327 ; Masqueray 1914, 72 ; et 1922, 166.

57 Voir Perrot 1910, 568 ; Weil 1869, 311 ; et 2014 (1875, 1880, 1890 et 1880), 210-1, 221, 437 et 466-7.

58 Voir Weil 2014 (1860, 1868, 1888, 1891, 1894, 1896, 1890, 1862, 1880 et 1876), 131-50, 191, 284, 292, 304, 308, 314, 331-6, 365, 424, 454, 465-7 et 503 ; Murray 1902, x1 ; et Hemmerdinger 1972, 99.

59 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, I ; Weil 2014 (1866, 1875, 1880, 1896, 1901, 1890, 1875, 1859 et 1897), 152-3, 210, 219, 359, 403, 423, 458, 468 et 504 ; Hemmerdinger 1972, 98 ; Bollack 1995, 33 et 35 ; et Calvié 2014, 57-9. Le zèle bibliographique de Weil est sans doute à l'origine des notices de Weil-Reinach (1900, XLVI-LII) sur les éditions anciennes du dialogue, comme celle de Burette (1735), restée hors de portée de Volkmann ("rarissimum librum, cuius duodecim tantum exemplaria typis excussa dicuntur non legi"), et sur les "notes manuscrites de Bachet de Méziriac" mentionnées par Burette (1733b, §1-62).

corriger mécaniquement les textes antiques, car il exérait “l'esprit de système”, se récriait contre les “opinions préconçues” qui hantent les travaux des philologues et se moquait de ceux qui singeaient “les procédés des sciences exactes”.⁶⁰ Il en a ainsi affirmé l'efficacité avec la plus grande prudence : “appliquées avec rigueur et discernement elles peuvent conduire à des résultats nouveaux et certains ou voisins de la certitude”.⁶¹ L'idée de critères permettant de déterminer mécaniquement (sans recourir au *iudicium*) la leçon remontant à l'archétype lui paraissait en particulier inadmissible : il ne vouait ainsi aucun culte au *stemma codicum* (l'une des formes philologiques du scientisme du 20^e siècle), qui aboutit à rejeter toute tentative de reconstitution du texte original des anciens auteurs en réduisant la tâche du philologue à la restitution mécanique de celui de l'archétype médiéval (un exemplaire en définitive quelconque et récent) et en soumettant son jugement à l'automatisme de la critique des fautes.⁶² Bien avant L. Canfora, il avait compris que “la distance entre l'archétype et la tradition conservée” est peu de chose en considération de “l'abysse très tempétueux qui sépare ce pauvre archétype de l'original”.⁶³ Cherchant à restituer le texte originel des ouvrages anciens et non celui d'archétypes médiévaux, Weil soutenait “qu'on se tromperait en affirmant que telle leçon doit être préférée par la seule raison qu'elle se trouve dans tel manuscrit” : “Un critérium aussi matériel est commode : il dispense de réfléchir. La vraie critique demande un choix raisonné, dicté par l'étude attentive de chaque texte en particulier et par la connaissance générale de la langue et de la manière de l'auteur”.⁶⁴ Il promouvait ainsi une ‘critique’ conforme à l'étymologie du mot, c'est-à-dire fondée sur le ‘jugement’ et le ‘bon sens’ : “le bon sens aidé des manuscrits”, “des scholies” ou “d'autres secours”.⁶⁵ Il affirmait même qu'établissement et interprétation des textes étaient indissociables (“si la critique ne peut être séparée de l'interprétation, celle-ci ne saurait non plus se passer de la critique”) et que “pour bien expliquer les auteurs anciens, il faut s'enquérir de la constitution de leur texte” ; il ajoutait que critique et herméneutique formaient les deux parties de l'ecdotique (“critique et interprétation se tiennent”) : l'éditeur d'un texte ancien doit l'établir “d'après les règles d'une saine critique” et “l'interpréter en pénétrant les intentions de l'auteur” ; et il donnait la primauté à la seconde

60 Voir Weil 1869, 305-6 ; Weil 1875, 146 ; Weil 1884c, 106 ; et Weil 2014 (1877 et 1888), 216 et 284.

61 Weil 2014 (1866), 162.

62 Voir Weil 1868, 313 ; Weil 1873, XLIV ; Weil 1884b III ; Weil 1885, 323 ; et Weil 2014 (1866 et 1868), 153 et 183.

63 Canfora 2012, 40-1.

64 Weil 1900b, 323.

65 Weil 2014 (1866 et 1868), 152 et 192.

(“on pourrait même faire rentrer la critique dans l’interprétation”).⁶⁶ Selon lui, la critique, qui impliquait une sorte de *dialectique de la lettre et l’esprit* (“contrôler l’esprit par la lettre et la lettre par l’esprit”), n’était donc pas tant une affaire de *forme* que de *sens* : les “phrases qui se comprennent” peuvent “laisser deviner le sens général de ce qu’on ne comprend pas” ; et il estimait que, pour “rétablir un passage gâté”, il convenait, non de “passer en revue toutes les catégories des erreurs possibles”, mais d’ “étudier ce passage, ce qui précède, ce qui suit” et de “se faire une idée de ce que l’auteur a dû dire”, c’est-à-dire de repenser “de point en point ce qu’un autre pensa” et d’en rendre compte à ses propres lecteurs, car “il est de leur intérêt” que la critique “soit bien faite”.⁶⁷ Cette articulation de la critique et de l’herméneutique structure ainsi toute l’introduction du *De musica*, de l’affirmation initiale qu’il reste “beaucoup à faire soit pour en améliorer le texte” soit “pour en élucider le sens” au rappel final que l’*ambition* des éditeurs s’est bornée à *améliorer* “quelques-unes de ses parties” et à en *éclairer* quelques-autres.⁶⁸

Fondée sur des principes originaux qui subordonnaient la critique des textes à leur interprétation et à leur histoire, la méthode ecdotique de Weil impliquait enfin la mise en place d’un dispositif susceptible d’accueillir à la fois l’histoire du texte à éditer (manuscrits et imprimés), sa restitution, la justification de son établissement, sa traduction, l’explication et la résolution de ses difficultés, son interprétation d’ensemble et les discussions relatives à son attribution, à sa signification historique et à sa valeur littéraire.⁶⁹ Confronté aux traditions éditoriales de l’Europe savante (brièveté des préfaces, texte grec sans traduction et notes exclusivement critiques en latin) et à l’organisation de la librairie française (séparation des ouvrages savants, scolaires et mondains), Weil dut attendre d’avoir 80 ans pour que l’érudit libraire E. Leroux, lui permit enfin d’adopter un tel dispositif dans ses publications de textes classiques : si celle du *De la Musique*, la dernière dont il fut le maître-d’œuvre, ressemble ainsi à ses précédentes éditions d’Eschyle, Euripide, Démosthène et Denys d’Halicarnasse, elle présente aussi quelques innovations qui offrent un cadre plus propice à la mise en œuvre de sa méthode. Les sections 1 et 4 de son introduction (“De la composition du *De Musica*” et “Des manuscrits et de l’état du texte”) ont certes leur équivalent dans les précédentes éditions de Weil ; mais les deux autres (“Des sources du *De Musica*” et “Attribution du dialogue”), qui remplacent les habituelles notices sur la vie et les écrits de l’auteur édité

66 Voir Weil 1889, 216 ; et 2014 (1866, 1868 et 1890), 162, 197, 201 et 423.

67 Weil 2014 (1866, 1894 et 1859), 151, 324 et 469.

68 Weil-Reinach 1900, I et XXXVIII.

69 Voir Calvié 2014, 60.

(réclamées par l'éditeur commercial L. Hachette), traitent en revanche des problèmes particuliers (sources et attribution) posés par la composition du dialogue. Les trois appendices de l'introduction sur les "manuscripts", les "imprimés" et les "*loci Plutarchi de musica*", qui allègent substantiellement ses deux derniers chapitres, rappellent les notes, notices et autres "*numerosum lyricorum conspectus*" insérées dans les introductions de l'Euripide et du Démosthène de Weil ou ajoutés aux fascicules de son premier Eschyle : tous allègent non moins efficacement leurs préfaces respectives.⁷⁰ Une liste de "signes conventionnels et abréviations" figure également en tête de son Euripide et de son *Alceste* (1891).⁷¹ Le texte grec de ces éditions et du Démosthène, accompagné ("à la marge des vers") "des chiffres qui figurent dans les éditions les plus répandues", présente lui aussi "les interpolations" "entre crochets droits []" et "les suppléments par conjecture" "entre crochets obliques <>", comme cela sera plus tard le cas dans la collection *Budé* :⁷² l'emploi des "lettres espacées" et des "autres signes conventionnels" (..., *, ** ... **, (***) et +) sont en revanche propres au *De la Musique* et tiennent au caractère particulièrement mutilé du texte et à son sujet (le + indique ainsi "une note surélevée d'un demi-dièse"). Deux blocs de notes critiques et exégétiques sont déjà placés sous le texte grec de ces mêmes éditions : au cœur du dispositif ecdotique, ils forment le cadre dans lequel Weil associe critique et herméneutique. La traduction, qui fait face au texte grec et au dessous de laquelle s'étale la suite des notes exégétiques, est, avec l'index, la principale innovation ecdotique du volume : elle permet de débarrasser les notes exégétiques des remarques linguistiques par trop élémentaires. Ces innovations n'ont rien de surprenant, car Weil était un fervent défenseur des index et considérait que la traduction pouvait exprimer "tous les menus détails de l'interprétation" : c'était sans doute ses éditeurs commerciaux précédents qui se refusaient à accompagner les textes grecs d'une version française et renaclait au surcoût induit par l'impression des index.⁷³ Toutes ses éditions sont enfin pourvues d'une table des matières et surtout d'"Addenda et corrigenda" permettant de les améliorer jusqu'à la fin de leur impression "en profitant des dernières découvertes philologiques".⁷⁴

Tel est donc le dispositif ecdotique dans lequel les deux collaborateurs ont pu mettre en pratique les principes de Weil, suivant une méthode qui articule

70 Voir Weil 1858, 141-56 ; 1860, 121-32 ; 1861, 115-24 ; 1862b, 115-27 ; 1864, 113-7 ; 1866, 110-22 ; 1867, 105-15 ; 1873, XXXIV-XXXV ; et 1879, 99-103.

71 Voir Weil 1879, LVI ; et 1891, 10.

72 Voir Weil 1879, XXX et XLVII-XLVIII ; et 1891, 10.

73 Weil 2014 (1847-89 et 1898), 107 et 371.

74 Weil-Reinach 1900, I et 165.

histoire, interprétation et critique des textes, tant dans l'analyse d'ensemble du dialogue (introduction) que dans celle de ses moindres parties (notes critiques et exégétiques).

4 L'application de l'ecdotique de Weil dans le *De la Musique*

La remarquable introduction de l'édition Weil-Reinach, qui se ressent entièrement de l'influence de Weil et qui a les qualités de ses propres écrits (simplicité, ordre et clarté),⁷⁵ est l'une des pièces maîtresses du dispositif ecdotique du volume, car elle inscrit d'emblée l'analyse textuelle du dialogue dans sa dimension historique et fixe en même temps le cadre herméneutique et critique général dans lequel doit s'exercer la *dialectique de la lettre et l'esprit* présidant à l'établissement et à l'interprétation de son texte. Il convient donc d'en rendre compte avant d'aborder le problème crucial de l'*interventionnisme* caractéristique de cette édition et de l'ecdotique de Weil.

Après un jugement sur la valeur littéraire "des plus médiocres" du dialogue (son appartenance "au genre *deipnosophistique*" et sa maladresse de "plume novice") et l'analyse de sa composition (un recueil d'extraits de "lectures musicologiques" à "valeur documentaire" soudés "tant bien que mal les uns aux autres"), l'introduction traite essentiellement de l'histoire de son texte. L'exposé de ses sources essentiellement aristoxéniennes débouche sur le problème de l'attribution de "cette compilation assez hâtive" d'un "petit nombre d'ouvrages facilement accessibles" : les deux collaborateurs rapportent les objections des opposants à son "attribution traditionnelle", les réfutent, reprennent à leur compte "l'analogie remarquable" découverte par P.-J. Burette "entre l'entrée en matière anecdotique" du *De Musica* et "les connaissances musicales" de l'auteur du dialogue, d'une part, et, de l'autre, "les débuts" de nombreux opuscules de Plutarque et le savoir musical dispensé dans ses autres écrits (voir l'appendice C) ; et, affirmant que cette attribution "repose sur le témoignage unanime des manuscrits", soutiennent finalement qu'il s'agit d'une œuvre de la "première jeunesse" de Plutarque.⁷⁶ Cette attribution, qui n'a toujours pas reçu de réfutation en règle (mais à laquelle s'oppose "la conviction aujourd'hui

75 Voir la lettre d'A. Böckh (1845) reproduite dans Perrot 1910, 553 ; et Calvié 2014, 59.

76 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, I-IV (I et IV) et XXIII-XXXI (XXIII, XXVII-XXVIII et XXXI) ; d'après Burette 1733A, 34-44 ; Volkmann 1856, IX-XIII (XI) ; et Westphal 1866, 19, 26 et 32. Cette attribution est conforme au jugement par ailleurs porté par Weil (s.d., 319) sur le style de Plutarque : "Plutarque est un écrivain négligé, il prend ses mots sans choix dans la langue usuelle, dans ses lectures, poètes et prosateurs, il en a de poétiques, d'abstraits, de

presque unanime des savants”), n’explique pas seulement la maladresse de “cet essai juvénile”, elle conditionne également toute l’histoire du texte du dialogue, qui “dut circuler dans un milieu restreint de parents et d’amis” : comme il n’est “cité par aucun auteur ancien à nous connu”, l’histoire de son texte ne peut être retracée de manière suivie avant “la *renaissance byzantine* et les premiers manuscrits”, bien que son “état déplorable” et son “désordre bizarre” témoignent d’accidents d’emblée subis par lui-même (les remaniements de l’auteur insérés au mauvais endroit par l’éditeur), voire par ses sources d’époque alexandrine ou classique.⁷⁷

L’étude des *codices* byzantins, qui doit selon Weil “être le point de départ de toute bonne critique”, est donc au cœur de cette histoire : dans la dernière section de l’introduction et la première de l’appendice, 28 des 39 manuscrits aujourd’hui connus du dialogue sont ainsi énumérés et sommairement décrits ; et 22 d’entre eux, dont 10 collationnés par Reinach lui-même (7 des 10 témoins antérieurs au 15^e siècle, dont le fameux *Marcianus* gr. App. cl. VI 10 [V ou v¹], fin du 12^e s.), sont également classés en “deux groupes” (ceux de Plutarque et ceux des musicographes grecs), auxquels correspondent deux *stemmata codicum*, qui sont les premiers du *De musica* et les ancêtres de presque tous ceux des musiciens grecs.⁷⁸ En vertu de ce classement, 14 apoglyphes, qui “descendent en droite ligne” de 8 manuscrits des 12^e-15^e siècles, apparaissent comme “dénusés de valeur critique” et peuvent être éliminés (*eliminatio codicum*) ; ces “deux groupes” ne correspondraient en outre pas à “deux recensions différentes”, mais “à deux branches issues du même tronc” ; et leurs “chefs de famille” dériveraient, “à travers un ou deux intermédiaires tout au

triviaux, mêlés au hasard : ses périodes sont longues, mal construites. À ne considérer que le détail de l’expression, Plutarque n’est pas un écrivain artiste”.

77 Voir Meriani 2003, 49 ; et Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXI et XXXVII.

78 Voir Weil 2014 (1866), 152-3 ; Amsel 1887, 124-5 et 152-6 (21 ms.) ; Jan 1895, XI-XCI (24 ms.) ; Jan 1899, 61 (1 ms., le seul alors connu à avoir échappé à Weil et Reinach) ; K. Ziegler 1953, III-VI (31 ms.) ; F. Lasserre 1954, 105-6 (35 ms.) ; Einarson-De Lacy 1986, 349 (39 ms.) ; Mathiesen 1988, 788 (39 ms.) ; et Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXIX-XLIV (XLI) : “collationné par Th. Reinach” (V¹). Comme les leçons de V¹ sont en outre régulièrement rapportées dans les notes critiques (voir Weil-Reinach 1900, 2, 6, 14, 16, 20, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, etc., 144, 146, 152, 158, 160, 162), l’affirmation de Wilamowitz que “le *Marcianus* n’a toujours pas été collationné” en 1921 et que Weil et Reinach ont édité le dialogue *De la Musique* “sans connaître le *Marcianus*” (Wilamowitz 1921, 77, n. 3) est dénuée de tout fondement. Voir enfin Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXII-XXXIII et XXXIX-XLVI ; Ziegler 1953, III-VII, Lasserre 1954, 109 et Einarson-De Lacy 1986, 349 ; et Düring 1930, LXIX ; et 1932, XXIX ; Da Rios 1954, CVI ; Winnington-Ingram 1963, XI et XVIII ; Najock 1972, 62 ; et 1975, XIX ; Barbera 1991, 79 ; et Terzès 2010, 189*

plus, d'un seul et même archétype". Si ces *stemmata codicum* procurent un fondement scientifique à l'édition critique du texte du dialogue, leur complexité interdit en même temps toute tentative de reconstitution mécanique du texte corrompu de l'archétype byzantin et, *a fortiori*, de l'original de l'auteur : "cet archétype, dont nous pouvons reconstituer la physionomie en retenant les éléments communs à tous nos manuscrits, avait un texte extrêmement corrompu et présentait un véritable répertoire de toutes les altérations paléographiques imaginables".⁷⁹ S'ensuit un classement des fautes intéressant "la date de l'archétype", qui relève lui aussi de l'histoire du texte du dialogue : des "peu nombreuses" confusions de minuscules, Weil et Reinach déduisent que "l'ancêtre commun" de tous les "manuscrits était déjà écrit en minuscule et ne remontait donc pas au-delà du 9^e siècle" ; que "les confusions dues à l'onziale" étant "beaucoup plus nombreuses", "le prototype oncial" devait précéder de peu "l'archétype minuscule" ; et que ce dernier datait donc probablement du "9^e ou 10^e siècle".⁸⁰ Loin de former une typologie stérile, ce classement, qui associe étroitement l'histoire et la critique du texte du dialogue, contribue ainsi à retracer la partie ancienne de son histoire et à restituer son état original, tout en servant de justification historique (*principe d'explicabilité*) à maintes corrections (critique conjecturale) de ses éditeurs.

Depuis que Wilamowitz a affirmé que l'édition Weil-Reinach du dialogue "prétendait en rétablir l'ordre avec des transpositions et des lacunes qui font fi de la critique", les philologues, qui avaient d'abord salué en elle un travail "laissant peu à désirer" et "aussi parfait qu'on puisse l'attendre de deux maîtres aussi compétents en la matière", se sont mis à rejeter son *interventionnisme* au nom du respect qui serait dû à la tradition manuscrite.⁸¹ C'est là un fort

79 Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXIII ; voir aussi Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXII-XXXIII ; Weil 1900b, 311 ; et 2014 (1866), 162.

80 Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXIII-XXXVII. Ce classement des principales corruptions du texte de l'archétype, qui est conforme à tous les exposés analogues donnés par Weil et ses élèves (voir Weil 1858, VI-VIII ; et 2014 (1866 et 1868), 157-8 et 195-200 ; Tournier 1875, dédié "À mon maître H. Weil", XXVII- XXVIII ; et Calvié 2014, 49), repose sur la distinction des quatre types de fautes déjà reconnus par Quintilien (I, 5, 6 et 38-41) : les *substitutions*, les *omissions*, les *additions* et les *transpositions*.

81 Voir d'une part Wilamowitz 1921, 77, 3 ; Johnson 1900, 332 ; Gleditsch 1901, 707 ; Hauvette 1901, XXVII ; et d'autre part Ziegler 1953, VII ; Lasserre 1954, 8 ; Flacelière 1955, 490 ; Borthwick 1956, 123 ; Winnington-Ingram 1956, 118 ; Barker 1984, 205 (voir aussi Barker 2014, 16, 1). Weil et Reinach, qui ont adopté nombre des corrections de leurs prédécesseurs, leur ont en effet ajouté 102 interventions de leur cru : 3 indications de lacune, 30 suppléments, 41 corrections, 15 suppressions et 13 transpositions (voir Weil-Reinach 1900, 2, 6, 8, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 28, 32, 34, 36, 40, 48, 52, 54, 56, 60, 62, 64, 68, 70, 74, 76, 78, 82, 84, 88,

mauvais procès, car le projet de Weil et Reinach n'était pas de reconstituer le "texte extrêmement corrompu" de l'archétype "en retenant les éléments communs à tous nos manuscrits",⁸² mais de restituer son état original, ce qui suppose précisément la recherche et la correction systématique des corruptions de cet archétype. Le parti-pris interventionniste de Weil et Reinach, qui repose sur l'attribution du dialogue à Plutarque (auteur dont on connaît la méthode, la langue et le style), peut paraître quelque peu aventureux ou naïf, mais il est assurément plus fécond que le parti-pris conservatiste de ses éditeurs postérieurs, qui implique le rejet en bloc de toutes les transpositions proposées par leurs prédécesseurs :⁸³ déniaient le dialogue à Plutarque, K. Ziegler lui donne ainsi pour auteur un "compilateur absolument idiot" et F. Lasserre un "faussaire" dont il souligne "la rédaction maladroite de ses exposés" ; si bien que le premier affirme que "l'ordre véritable de l'opuscule" ne peut "être restitué avec suffisamment de certitude" et le second que la conjecture y est "constamment compromise" ; et qu'ils s'efforcent ainsi tous deux de restituer le texte d'un archétype byzantin dont ils reconnaissent la corruption : "il fallait conserver l'ordonnancement de l'opuscule que présentent les manuscrits, bien qu'il soit indubitable qu'il ait été fort chamboulé".⁸⁴ Cette *pétition de principe scientiste*, qui refuse à la critique philologique ("par trop audacieuse") le droit de restituer l'état originel des textes antiques, la cantonne donc dans la restauration la plus mécanique possible d'un archétype sans valeur intrinsèque : c'est un *parti-pris minimaliste* qui fait abdiquer l'esprit humain et conduit, sous couvert de 'scientificité', à renoncer à la recherche de la vérité.⁸⁵ On peut certes reprocher à Weil et Reinach des erreurs de détail, mais il vaudra toujours mieux échouer dans la réalisation d'un projet qui a du sens que mener à bien une entreprise qui en a peu. Ce *procès en sorcellerie interventionniste* est d'autant plus malvenu que les éditeurs postérieurs du dialogue ont admis au total 27 (un gros quart) des 102 interventions de Weil et Reinach sur le texte du dialogue – près d'un tiers même (27 sur 89), si l'on fait abstraction de leurs 13 transpositions ; et que, conformément à l'un des deux objectifs qu'ils s'étaient fixés, le

90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 104, 112, 118, 120, 122, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, 136, 138, 140, 142, 144, 146, 148, 150, 156 et 162).

82 Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXIII.

83 F. Lasserre, qui est intervenu à 12 nouvelles reprises sur le texte du *De musica* (voir Lasserre 1954, 112 [*bis*], 119, 120, 122 [*bis*], 124 [*bis*], 125, 128 et 132 [*bis*]), n'a même adopté qu'une correction de Weil et Reinach (voir Lasserre 1954, 129), laquelle n'avait pas été acceptée par K. Ziegler, et il n'a mentionné leurs noms que deux autres fois (voir Lasserre 1954, 120 et 132).

84 Ziegler 1953, VII ; voir aussi Lasserre 1954, 8, 104 et 108 ; et Marrou 1955, 380.

85 Ce parti-pris est également celui de l'édition Einarson-De Lacy (1986, 349s.).

texte du *De musica* est donc sorti de leurs mains “amélioré dans quelques-unes de ses parties”.⁸⁶ Ils ont en outre mis en œuvre tout un arsenal de procédés graphiques pour informer scrupuleusement leur lecteur des leçons figurant dans les manuscrits et les éditions précédentes, si bien qu’il peut contrôler si “la critique des textes” a été “bien faite”, mais aussi reconstituer lui-même le texte de l’archétype.⁸⁷ Quant aux affirmations que leur édition a “à ce point bouleversé l’ordre des phrases de l’opuscule” qu’on y “trouve avec peine le passage qu’on cherche” et que “le dialogue du Pseudo-Plutarque” y est “illisible”, elles sont tout à fait fallacieuses.⁸⁸ Outre l’indication des pages de l’édition Wechel et des chapitres de Wyttenbach, les signes ** ... ** et (***) , placés dans le corps du texte, signalent respectivement un “morceau transposé” et “une place occupée dans les manuscrits” par un morceau “transposé ailleurs” : il suffit dès lors de se reporter aux notes critiques pour trouver indiquées les places originales et finales des passages ainsi pointés.⁸⁹

Loin d’être ‘irréfléchie’, ‘arbitraire’ ou ‘capricieuse’, la critique conjecturale de Weil, qui découle de la reconnaissance de la *primauté du sens*, est au contraire extrêmement exigeante, car elle implique que l’éditeur soit capable de *rendre compte* du texte qu’il édite, dans son ensemble (introduction) comme dans ses moindres détails (classement des fautes, notes critiques et exégétiques). Or ce texte ne doit pas seulement être grammaticalement et sémantiquement admissible : il doit être conforme à la pensée, à la langue, à la phraséologie,

86 Weil-Reinach 1900, XXXVIII. Ziegler, qui a apporté 12 nouvelles modifications à son texte (1953, 3 [bis], 6, 10, 11, 13, 19, 28, 33, 35 [bis] et 36), a adopté 22 de celles de ses deux prédécesseurs, par ailleurs mentionnés à presque toutes les pages de son appareil critique (1953, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 15 [bis], 16 [bis], 20, 23, 25, 26, 27 [bis], 29, 30, 31 [bis] et 33) ; quant à l’édition Einarson-De Lacy, à laquelle incombent 5 nouvelles modifications du texte (1986, 360, 386, 394, 402 et 424), elle admet 13 des interventions de Weil et Reinach, dont 4 de celles rejetées par Ziegler et Lasserre (1986, 358, 360, 378, 392, 402, 406, 416, 420, 428, 434, 438, 442 et 448).

87 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, LXXI-LXXII ; Weil, 1858, XIII-XV ; et 1868, XLV-XLVI ; 1873, L-LI ; 1879, XLV-XLVI ; et Weil 2014 (1866), 151. Ils ont toutefois omis de préciser l’origine des corrections de εἴπερ en ἤπερ et de πάλιν en πάλην (voir Weil-Reinach 1900, 64, § 157 ; et 100, § 260).

88 Voir Ziegler 1953, VII ; et Lasserre 1954, 8. Cette sévérité est d’autant plus déplacée que Lasserre (1954, 109 et 152) a lui-même reconnu avoir utilisé l’apparat de Weil et Reinach pour établir le *stemma codicum* du dialogue et devoir “beaucoup” à leur “commentaire”, comme à “la traduction qu’il accompagne” : voir Flacelière 1955, 192, où il est déjà reproché à Lasserre d’être “bien sévère pour le travail de Weil et Reinach, qui, à beaucoup d’égards, reste supérieur au sien”.

89 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, 36 [** ... **] : N.C. – 87-88. *Libri post 96 ; transposuimus* ; et 38 [(***)] : *Post 96 libri 87-88. Correximus*.

au style de son auteur, de son époque, du genre littéraire et de la tradition auxquels il appartient ; et, conçu comme un *tout organique*, il doit former un ensemble sémantiquement et stylistiquement cohérent, constitué de parties elles-mêmes grammaticalement, phraséologiquement et sémantiquement cohérentes. L'éditeur doit donc connaître à fond le texte qu'il édite, l'œuvre complète de son auteur, les autres écrits appartenant à son genre littéraire, la tradition dans laquelle il s'inscrit, l'histoire des textes antiques et les ressources de la critique pour pouvoir mettre en branle la *dialectique de la lettre et de l'esprit* : s'assurer que le texte a "reçu quelque atteinte", reconnaître "la nature de la faute" et "y appliquer le remède convenable", après avoir étudié le passage fautif, "ce qui précède, ce qui suit" pour "se faire une idée de ce que l'auteur a dû dire" (primauté du sens).⁹⁰ Mais il doit également faire preuve de 'jugement' et de 'bon sens', en se défiant de 'l'esprit de système', des 'opinions préconçues' et de tout mécanicisme.⁹¹ La première correction apportée au texte du dialogue suffit à illustrer tout cela. Weil et Reinach ont une telle connaissance de la littérature grecque que la dernière phrase de la section 1 du dialogue (ὅσῳ οὖν ἡ ἐκ παιδείας ὠφέλεια μείζων πάντων στρατηγημάτων, τοσούτῳ καὶ ἡ περὶ αὐτῆς μνήμη ἀξία σπουδῆς) leur rappelle le début du *Banquet* de Xénophon, un morceau classique qu'aucun écrivain de l'époque impériale ne pouvait ignorer : τὰ μετὰ σπουδῆς πραττόμενα ἀξιολογούμενα εἶναι ('ce que l'on fait avec zèle est digne de mémoire'). Dès lors, la phrase du *De musica* ('autant donc les avantages de l'instruction l'emportent sur tous les exploits militaires, autant la mémoire qui a l'instruction pour objet est digne de zèle') leur paraît suspecte : "c'est le zèle pour l'érudition qui est digne de mémoire, et non la mémoire de l'érudition qui est digne de zèle", note Reinach. Pour s'assurer que le texte a "reçu quelque atteinte" et "se faire une idée" plus claire "de ce que l'auteur a dû dire" (*primauté du sens*), ils relisent "ce qui précède" et y trouvent l'analogie établie par les premières phrase du texte entre 'les exploits militaires' de Phocion (τὰ Φωκίωνος στρατηγήματα), qui sont la 'parure de sa femme' (κόσμον αὐτῆς), et le 'zèle de [son] maître pour l'étude' (τὴν τοῦ ἐμοῦ διδασκάλου περὶ λόγους σπουδὴν), qui est celle de l'auteur (κόσμον ἐμὸν). Or cette analogie rend caduque la leçon des manuscrits, car elle met en cause le zèle d'Onésicratès pour l'étude qui est une parure pour son disciple et est donc digne de mémoire, non le zèle de ce dernier pour la mémoire de son maître. L'exigence de cohérence implique donc qu'à la locution τὴν περὶ λόγους σπουδὴν réponde, non ἡ περὶ αὐτῆς μνήμη, mais ἡ περὶ αὐτὴν [παιδείαν] σπουδὴ ; et que la leçon des manuscrits (ἡ περὶ αὐτῆς μνήμη ἀξία σπουδῆς) soit corrigée en ἡ περὶ αὐτὴν μνήμης ἀξία σπουδὴ : "ce rapprochement

90 Weil 2014 (1868), 195-7 et 201.

91 Voir Weil 1869, 306 ; 2014 (1866, 1868 et 1877), 152, 192 et 216.

[avec Xénophon] et le rappel du mot *σπουδή* employé au § 2 justifient notre correction” ; ce faisant, Weil et Reinach rendent au texte son caractère scolaire de préambule rhétorique (tradition du genre littéraire du dialogue et usage de Plutarque), qui est sensible dans leur traduction, alors qu’il est totalement absent de celle de Lasserre, qui conserve la leçon des manuscrits et élimine toute trace du “rappel du mot *σπουδή* employé au § 2”.⁹² On peut certes justifier l’irrégularité de l’analogie du préambule en arguant de “l’extrême médiocrité” et de “la rédaction maladroite” de l’auteur, mais il est alors difficile de trouver en un si maladroite compilateur un “faussaire” qui aurait “cherché à continuer les *Propos*” de Plutarque, alors même qu’il était incapable d’établir une analogie cohérente dans un préambule rhétorique, ce que les Grecs de l’époque impériale apprenaient assurément à faire à l’école du *γραμματικός*.⁹³ On peut aussi reprocher à Weil et Reinach d’avoir dérogé à leur usage en n’accompagnant pas leur correction d’une justification paléographique qui ait consisté en une explication historique de la corruption du texte : mais ce serait oublier que ce type de fautes avait été expliqué en bloc dans l’introduction, où sont mentionnées les altérations du texte comme “l’influence par écho de la terminaison d’un mot sur celle du mot suivant”.⁹⁴ Il serait enfin d’autant plus injuste de taxer d’*audacieuse* cette correction que, se défiant de tout esprit de système et des limites de la connaissance moderne des usages du grec ancien, ses inventeurs se sont bien gardés de corriger un autre défaut de la même phrase du texte (pointé par Volkmann).⁹⁵ Comme nombre de leurs émendations, cette

92 Weil 2014 (1868), 195-7 ; Weil-Reinach 1900, 3 : “La femme de Phocion [...] disait qu’elle avait pour parure les exploits militaires de son mari. Quant à moi, je regarde comme une parure, non seulement pour moi-même, mais pour tous mes familiers, le zèle de mon maître pour l’étude [...]. Autant donc les avantages qu’on retire de l’instruction l’emportent sur tous les exploits militaires, autant le zèle qui a l’instruction pour objet est digne de mémoire” ; et Lasserre 1954, 133 : “La femme de Phocion [...] disait n’avoir d’autres bijoux que les exploits militaires de son mari : pour moi, je tiens que ma parure, qui n’est pas seulement la mienne mais aussi celle de tous mes collègues, c’est le goût de mon maître pour les sciences [...]. Aussi mérite-t-elle [l’instruction] d’autant plus qu’on en fasse l’objet d’un traité qu’elle surpasse en utilité toutes les inventions de l’art de la guerre”.

93 Voir Lasserre 1954, 100 et 108 ; et Marrou 1948, 260-4.

94 Weil-Reinach 1900, xxxiii.

95 Weil-Reinach 1900, 3 : “Quant à l’emploi de *ἀξία* pour *ἀξιώτερα* après *ὅσω μείζων*, c’est un prétendu hellénisme qui correspond à l’idiotisme inverse, beaucoup plus fréquent, *τοσούτω* avec le comparatif suivi de *ὅσω* avec le positif (*Thesaurus*, col. 2297) ; nous n’en connaissons pas d’autre exemple et peut-être la correction de Volkmann [“Volkmann coniecit : *μᾶλλον ἀξία*, sive *ἀξιώτερα*”] devrait-elle être adoptée” ; voir aussi Volkmann 1856, 56.

correction est non seulement brillante, mais aussi précieuse, en ce qu'elle souligne un problème de cohérence textuelle jusque-là passé sous silence, qui mérite dorénavant d'être pris en compte, expliqué et discuté. Le seul grief qu'on puisse adresser à Weil et Reinach en la matière est d'avoir trop souvent intégré leurs conjectures dans le texte de leur édition, au lieu de s'en tenir prudemment à les consigner dans leurs notes critiques. Comment tolérer, par exemple, que leur restitution du § 243 (23, 1139E) figure dans le texte lui-même, alors qu'il est précisé en note qu'ils se sont "efforcés de restituer le sens, non les paroles de Plutarque" ?⁹⁶

Telle est donc la démarche critique dont relèvent aussi les transpositions contre lesquelles Marrou s'est en particulier récrié de manière injuste et très inexacte.⁹⁷ La "critique conjecturale" dont Weil et Reinach sont les "héritiers" remonte non au "19^e siècle", mais à la Renaissance ; ceux-ci l'ont cependant fait bénéficier des derniers acquis de la *recensio* (*stemma codicum*) et de l'histoire des textes ; la prétendue "double tradition manuscrite" du dialogue est en fait formée de "deux branches issues du même tronc" ; les deux éditeurs n'ont nullement substitué ἀρμονικῆς ῥυθμικῆς μετρικῆς à διατόνου χρώματος ἀρμονίας, mais ont transposé ces mots après τριῶν δ' ὄντων γενῶν εἰς ἃ διήρηται τὸ ἡρμωσμένον (34, 1143e, § 331) et ont inséré le supplément < ἀρμονικῆς ῥυθμικῆς μετρικῆς > au § 325 ; et cette restitution n'a nullement été faite "gratuitement".⁹⁸ On s'accorde en effet, depuis Westphal, à reconnaître l'origine aristoxénienne de la section à laquelle appartiennent ces deux passages.⁹⁹ Or Weil et Reinach, qui connaissaient très bien l'œuvre d'Aristoxène, savaient pertinemment que celui-ci n'aurait pu écrire qu'il y a trois parties (μερῶν) en lesquelles la musique en son entier (ἡ πᾶσα μουσική) se divise de manière générale (τὴν καθόλου διαίρεσιν), le diatonique, le chromatique, l'enharmonique, pour la bonne raison qu'il a au contraire souligné (*El. harm.* B 32 Meibom = 41.9-11 Da Rios) que la musique ne se réduit pas à l'harmonique et que cette dernière n'en est qu'une

96 Weil-Reinach 1900, 96 ("nos sensum, non ipsa verba Plutarchi, restituere conati sumus").

97 Marrou 1955, 380 : "héritiers de la critique conjecturale du 19^e siècle, Weil et Reinach, avec une parfaite bonne conscience et une hardiesse que rien ne vient brider, transposent, corrigent à chaque pas tout ce qui leur paraît contraire à leur idée du grec ou de la musique. Là où, unanime, une riche et double tradition manuscrite (car le *De Musica* nous est parvenu à la fois dans le corpus des musicographes et dans l'édition planudéenne de Plutarque) nous dit par exemple : *la musique se divise en trois parties : le diatonique, le chromatique et l'harmonique* (c. 32, 1142 D), Weil-Reinach substituent gratuitement : ... *trois branches : harmonique, rythmique, métrique* (leur § 325)".

98 Voir Weil-Reinach 1900, xxxiis. ; Lasserre 1954, 107-9 ; Meriani 2003, 62.

99 Voir Westphal 1866, 18 ; Weil-Reinach 1900, xviii ; Lasserre 1954, 104 ; Helmbold-O'Neil 1959, 12 ; Meriani 2003, 58-69.

partie, ‘comme le sont aussi la rythmique, la métrique et l’organique’ : μέρος γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἀρμονικὴ πραγματεία τῆς τοῦ μουσικοῦ ἕξεως, καθάπερ ἡ τε ῥυθμικὴ καὶ ἡ μετρικὴ καὶ ἡ ὀργανικὴ.¹⁰⁰ Il est donc exclu qu’Aristoxène ait joint l’adjectif πᾶσα au substantif μουσική pour désigner une simple partie de la musique, et employé la locution τὴν καθόλου διαίρεσιν pour évoquer sa tripartition générique (elle n’occupe qu’un chapitre de son harmonique). C’est pourquoi Weil et Reinach ont rapproché ce § 325 des *loci classici* de Martianus Capella (9.936) et d’Aristide Quintilien (1.5) sur la division de ‘la musique en son entier’ (τῆς πάσης μουσικῆς), auxquels ils auraient pu ajouter les témoignages concordants de Porphyre (191 Wallis = 5.21-24 Düring), des *Anonymes de Bellermand* (30 = 9.8-14 Najock) ou de la *Lettre sur la musique entière* de Michel Psellos (337.12-338.11 Abert). Or la lecture de “ce qui suit” confirme la corruption du texte et permet en outre de “se faire une idée” plus claire “de ce que l’auteur a dû dire”, car on y trouve employés les termes ποιήσεως et ἐρμηνείας, qui énoncent les objets respectifs des deux parties pratiques de la musique (τὸ χρηστικόν et τὸ ἐξαγγελτικόν) figurant dans la division de la musique d’Aristide Quintilien (la partie χρηστικόν est d’ailleurs appelée ποιητικὴ dans le passage analogue de Porphyre) : cette correspondance, qui confirme le rapprochement des deux textes, justifie donc la suppression des mots διατόνου χρώματος ἀρμονίας et leur remplacement par ἀρμονικῆς ῥυθμικῆς μετρικῆς, *indispensables* à la compréhension de l’ensemble. Si l’on continue d’“étudier ce passage” et “ce qui suit”, on tombe en outre bientôt sur le début du § 331 (= 34, 1143e), où le membre de phrase τριῶν δ’ ὄντων γενῶν εἰς ἃ διήρηται τὸ ἡρμολογούμενον n’est pas suivi de l’énumération attendue des trois genres mélodiques (γενῶν), laquelle devrait précisément avoir la forme de la leçon fautive des manuscrits au § 325 (διατόνου χρώματος ἀρμονίας). Il faut donc supposer que “les mots ἀρμονικῆς ῥυθμικῆς μετρικῆς, qui sont indispensables” ont “été expulsés du texte par une glose qui, en réalité, se rapportait au § 331”, l’une de ces “gloses et notes explicatives” qui ont parfois pris “la place de mots autres” que ceux qu’elles devaient expliquer, “de manière à faire double emploi avec ces derniers et à causer l’omission d’une idée nécessaire”.¹⁰¹ Le *principe d’explicabilité* de la faute supposée nécessitait enfin que soit explicitées les conditions de possibilité de celle-ci : c’est pourquoi Weil et Reinach ont émis l’hypothèse que les § 325 et § 331 aient pu, “dans

100 Weil avait une l’excellente connaissance des écrits aristoxéniens (voir Weil 2014 [1855, 1862, 1865, 1872, 1875, 1884 et 1898], 447-63) ; tout comme Reinach (voir Reinach 1926, 172s.), dont l’exemplaire de Marquard 1868 est visible dans la bibliothèque de la Villa Kérylos, cette “demeure inspirée des maisons de Délos” qu’il avait fait édifier, entre 1904 et 1908, à “Beaulieu-sur-mer, entre Nice et Monaco” (Leclant 2008, 10s.).

101 Weil 2014 (1866), 159-62.

l'archétype", être "vis à vis l'un de l'autre".¹⁰² Le supplément et la transposition à l'aide desquels ils ont voulu restituer le texte original du dialogue n'est donc nullement 'irréfléchi' ou 'gratuit' : il est exigé par le *principe d'intelligibilité*, le contexte et la tradition des musiciens grecs ; et il est justifié par des considérations historiques et codicologiques.

Puissent donc ces deux exemples suffire à convaincre ceux qui s'intéressent au texte original du dialogue (et pas seulement à celui de l'archétype des manuscrits médiévaux et humanistiques) qu'ils doivent se garder de rejeter en bloc les corrections et transpositions de Weil et Reinach. Elles constituent en effet un trésor d'érudition et d'intelligence où sont soulevés pour la première fois nombre de problèmes textuels réellement posés par un texte profondément corrompu. Quant aux "réorganisations étendues du texte" dont A. Barker a naguère supposé que "personne, à part les éditeurs eux-mêmes", ne les avait "jamais admises",¹⁰³ elles devront être le point de départ de toute recherche à venir sur l'histoire du texte du dialogue et de toute tentative de reconstitution matérielle des différents états par lesquels il est passé avant de prendre la forme qu'il avait dans l'archétype Ω . Car il faudra bien s'atteler un jour à cette dernière tâche, ainsi que l'a souligné R. P. Winnington-Ingram : "ce n'est pas parce que Weil et Reinach ont exagéré que la question de la dislocation des cahiers doit être mise en veille".¹⁰⁴

Bibliography

- Amsel, G. 1887. *De vi atque indole rhythmorum qui veteres iudicaverint* (Breslau).
- Babelon, E. 1908. *Allocution à l'occasion du 90^e anniversaire de M. Henri Weil*, CRAI 52, 88s.
- Barbera, A. 1991. *The Euclidean Division of the Canon* (Lincoln/London).
- Barker, A. 1984. *Greek Musical Writings : 1. The Musician and his Art* (Cambridge).
- Barker, A. 2014. *Ancient Greek Writers on their Musical Past. Studies in Greek Musical Historiography* (Pisa/Roma).
- Basch, S., Espagne, M. & Leclant, J. (éd.). *Les frères Reinach* (Paris).
- Bélis, A. 2008. *Théodore Reinach (1860-1928) et la musique grecque*, in : Basch, S. & al. 2008, 165-76.
- Bollack, J. 1995. *La référence allemande dans les études philologiques à l'École normale*, in : Espagne, M. (éd.). *L'École normale supérieure et l'Allemagne* (Leipzig), 23-38.

102 Weil-Reinach 1900, 130.

103 Barker 2014, 16.

104 Winnington-Ingram 1956, 119.

- Bollack, J. 1997. *La Grèce de personne* (Paris).
- Bollack, J. 2013. *Au jour le jour* (Paris).
- Borthwick, E. 1956. Compte rendu de *Plutarch De Musica*, CR 6, 122-4.
- Bouché-Leclercq, A. 1909. *Séance du 12 février & Séance du 26 février*, CRAI 53, 116-125 & 182-94.
- Burette, P.-J. 1733a. *Examen du Traité de Plutarque sur la Musique*, Memoires de littérature tirez des registres de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres 8, 27-44.
- Burette, P.-J. 1733b. *Observations touchant l'histoire littéraire du dialogue de Plutarque sur la Musique*, Memoires de littérature tirez des registres de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres 8, 44-62.
- Burette, P.-J. 1735. *Dialogue de Plutarque sur la musique* (Paris).
- Cagnat, R. 1931. *Notice sur la vie et les travaux de M. Théodore Reinach*, CRAI 75, 374-93.
- Calvié, L. 2014. *La philologie selon Henri Weil*, in : Weil, H. 2014, 13-64.
- Calvié, L. 2015. *L'enseignement de Henri Weil à l'École normale d'après un document inédit*, in : Loubet, M. & Pralon, D. *Poikiloï karpōi. Exégèses païennes, juives et chrétiennes* (Aix-en-Provence), 461-9.
- Canfora, L. 2012. *Le copiste comme auteur* (Toulouse).
- Cannatà Fera, M. 2011. *Plutarco nel De musica*, QUCC 99, 191-206.
- Croiset, A. 1887. *Listes*, AAEEG 21, X-LVI.
- Dain, A. 1975. *Les manuscrits grecs* (Paris).
- Da Rios, R. 1954. *Aristoxeni Elementa harmonica* (Romae)
- D'Eichthal, E. & Reinach, Th. 1892. *Notes sur les problèmes musicaux dits d'Aristote*, REG 5, 22-52.
- Duchêne, H. 1996. *Un Athénien : Salomon Reinach*, BCH 120, 273-84.
- Düring, I. 1930. *Die Harmonielehre des Klaudios Ptolemaios* (Göteborg).
- Düring, I. 1932. *Porphyrius. Kommentar zur Harmonielehre des Ptolemaios* (Göteborg).
- Einarson, B., De Lacy, Ph. 1986. *Plutarch's Moralia XIV* (Cambridge/London).
- Fauré, G., Reinach, Th. & Weil, H. 1894. *Hymne à Apollon* (Paris).
- Flacelière, R. 1955. *Plutarque. De la musique*, AC 24, 490-2.
- Geffroy, A. 1880. *Fouilles entreprises par M. Salomon Reinach à Rome*, CRAI 8, 16s.
- Gleditsch, H. 1901. *Plutarque. De la musique*, PhW 21, 705-8.
- Glotz, G., Reinach, Th. 1909. *Bibliographie scientifique de Henri Weil*, REG 22, 383-404.
- Glotz, G. 1928. *Éloge funèbre de M. Théodore Reinach, membre de l'Académie*, CRAI 72, 321-6.
- Graux, Ch. 1881. *Conférences de M. Graux, Rapport sur l'École pratique des hautes études. Section des sciences historiques et philologiques (1880-1881)*, 8-10.
- Hauvette, A. 1901. *Rapport*, REG 14, 12-29.
- Havet, L. 1911. *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris).
- Helmbold, W. & O'Neil, E. 1959. *Plutarch's Quotations* (Baltimore).

- Hemmerdinger, B. 1972. *Henri Weil. Entretien avec Madame Dufour*, Belfagor 27, 96-9.
- Hummel, P. 1994. *Henri Weil entre France et Allemagne*, in : Espagne, M. (éd.). *L'École normale supérieure et l'Allemagne* (Leipzig), 241-64.
- Hummel, P. 1995. *Humanités normaliennes. L'enseignement classique et l'érudition philologique dans l'École normale supérieure du XIX^e siècle* (Paris).
- Jan, K. (von). 1895. *Musici scriptores Graeci* (Lipsiae).
- Jan, K. (von). 1899. *Musici scriptores Graeci. Supplementum* (Lipsiae).
- Johnson, C. 1900. *Plutarque. De la musique*, AJPh 21, 331-3.
- Lasserre, F. 1955. *Plutarque. De la musique* (Olten-Lausanne).
- Lavissee, E. 1884. *Charles Graux*, in : *Mélanges Graux* (Paris), XI-L.
- Leclant, J. 2008. *Avant-propos*, in : Basch, S. & al. 2008, 7-12.
- Mahaffy, J. P. 1899. *Compte rendu de Mélanges Weil*, CR 13, 447s.
- Marrou, H.-I. 1948. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité* (Paris).
- Marrou, H.-I. 1955. *Compte rendu de Plutarque. De la musique*, REG 68, 380-3.
- Masqueray, P. 1914. *Bibliographie pratique de la littérature grecque* (Paris).
- Masqueray, P. 1922. *Eschyle I*, REA 24, 165-8.
- Mathiesen, Th. 1988. *Ancient Greek Music Theory* (München).
- Meriani, A. 2003. *Sulla musica greca antica. Studi e ricerche* (Napoli).
- Mioni, E. 1960. *Codices Graeci manuscripti II* (Roma).
- Monod, G. 1909. *Obsèques de M. Henri Weil. Discours*, REG 22, 377-9.
- Mulliez, D. 2008. *Les Reinach et l'École française d'Athènes*, in : Basch, S. & al. 2008, 41-56.
- Murray, G. 1902. *Euripidis fabulae I* (Oxonii).
- Najock, D. 1972. *Drei anonyme griechische Traktate über die Musik* (Göttingen).
- Najock, D. 1975. *Anonyma de musica scripta Bellermanniana* (Leipzig).
- Omont, H. 1898. *Inventaire du Trésor de la Bibliothèque du monastère de Stroumitza*, in : *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris), 300-20.
- Omont, H. 1933. *Bibliographie des travaux de M. Henri Omont* (Paris/Toulouse).
- Perrot, G. 1910. *Notice sur la vie et les travaux de Henri Weil*, in : Weil 2014, 531-87.
- Reinach, F. 2008. *Note sur Hermann Reinach (Francfort, 1814-Paris, 1899)*, in : Basch, S. & al. 2008, 13-8.
- Reinach, S. 1907. *Manuel de philologie classique* (Paris).
- Reinach, Th. 1888. *Parties administrative, Chronique, Actes de l'Association*, REG 1, XXXIII-LXVIII & 108-26.
- Reinach, Th. 1893. *La musique des hymnes de Delphes*, BCH 17, 584-610.
- Reinach, Th. 1894. *La musique du nouvel hymne de Delphes*, BCH 18, 363-89.
- Reinach, Th. 1896. *Deux fragments de musique grecque*, REG 9, 186-215.
- Reinach, Th. 1898. *Deux fragments d'hyporchèmes anonymes*, in : *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris), 413-22.
- Reinach, Th. 1898b. *Les nouveaux fragments rythmiques d'Aristoxène*, REG 11, 389-415.
- Reinach, Th. 1904. *Euripide. Électre, Oreste*, REG 17, 476.

- Reinach, Th. 1909. *Obsèques de M. Henri Weil. Discours*, REG 22, 379-82.
- Reinach, Th. 1926. *La musique grecque* (Paris).
- Reinach, Th., Weil, H. 1893. *Papyrus de Berlin*, REG 6, 139s.
- Samuel, P. 2008. *Autres aspects de la vie de Henri Weil* (Ambérieu, coll. privée, Ms.).
- Steve, M. 2014. *Théodore Reinach* (Nice).
- Terzès, Chr. 2010. ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ <ΤΕΧΝΗ ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗ> (Athenai).
- Tournier, É. 1866. Compte rendu de H Weil, *Aeschyli tragoediae*, RCr 2, 325-7.
- Tournier, É. 1875. *Exercices critiques de la Conférence de philologie grecque de l'École Pratique des Hautes-Études (1^{er} août 1872-1^{er} août 1875)* (Paris).
- Volkman, R. 1856. *Plutarchi De musica* (Lipsiae).
- Weil, H. 1858. *Aeschyli Agamemno* (Giessae).
- Weil, H. 1858-1867. *Aeschyli quae supersunt tragoediae* (Giessae).
- Weil, H. 1860. *Aeschyli Choephoroi* (Giessae).
- Weil, H. 1861. *Aeschyli Eumenides* (Giessae).
- Weil, H. 1862. *Die Wiederherstellung der Dramen des Aeschylus*, JkPh 85, 351-6.
- Weil, H. 1862b. *Aeschyli Septem contra Thebas* (Giessae).
- Weil, H. 1864. *Aeschyli Prometheus vinctus* (Giessae).
- Weil, H. 1866. *Aeschyli Supplices* (Giessae).
- Weil, H. 1867. *Aeschyli Persae* (Giessae).
- Weil, H. 1868. *Sept tragédies d'Euripide* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1869. Compte rendu de É. Burnouf, *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, RCr 4, 305-11.
- Weil, H. 1873. *Les Harangues de Démosthène* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1875. Compte rendu de W. Christ, *Métrie des Grecs et des Romains*, RCr 9, 146-50.
- Weil, H. 1876. *Conférences de M. Weil*, Rapport sur l'École pratique des hautes études. Section des sciences historiques et philologiques (1875-1876), 3-5.
- Weil, H. 1877. *Les Plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène. Première série* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1878. *Denys d'Halicarnasse. Première lettre à Ammée* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1879. *Sept tragédies d'Euripide* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1879b. *Conférences de M. Weil*, Rapport sur l'École pratique des hautes études. Section des sciences historiques et philologiques (1877-1879), 43-5.
- Weil, H. 1880. *Conférences de M. Weil*, Rapport sur l'École pratique des hautes études. Section des sciences historiques et philologiques (1879-1880), 5-6.
- Weil, H. 1881. *Les Harangues de Démosthène* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1883. *Les Plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène. Première série* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1884. *D'un signe critique dans le meilleur manuscrit de Démosthène*, in : *Mélanges Graux* (Paris), 13-20.
- Weil, H. 1884b. *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Lipsiae).
- Weil, H. 1884c. *Aristoxène de Tarente*, JS, 106-14.

- Weil, H. 1885. Compte rendu de N. Wecklein, *Aeschyli fabulae*, RCr 19, 323-8.
- Weil, H. 1886. *Les Plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène. Deuxième série* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1887. Compte rendu de E. Schwartz, *Scholies d'Euripide* 1, RCr 23, 461s.
- Weil, H. 1889. *Les drames d'Euripide*, JS, 174-185 & 212-23.
- Weil, H. 1891. *Euripide. Alceste* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1892. Compte rendu de E. Schwartz, *Scholies d'Euripide* 11, RCr 33, 272s.
- Weil, H. 1893. *Nouveaux fragments d'hymnes accompagnés de notes de musique*, BCH 17, 569-83.
- Weil, H. 1894. *Un nouvel hymne à Apollon*, BCH 18, 345-62.
- Weil, H. 1894b. Compte rendu de O. Daehnardt, *Les scholies des Perses*, RCr 38, 216-8.
- Weil, H. 1895. *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaïsme*, JS, 325-7.
- Weil, H. 1898. *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1900. *Études sur l'Antiquité grecque* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1900b. *Livres offerts*, CRAI 44, 311-3.
- Weil, H. 1902. *Études de littérature et de rythmique grecques* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1905. *Sept tragédies d'Euripide* (Paris).
- Weil, H. 1907. *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Lipsiae).
- Weil, H. 1910. *Aeschyli tragoediae* (Lipsiae).
- Weil, H. 2014. *L'art de lire. Études sur l'ancienne poésie grecque* (Toulouse).
- Weil, H. s.d. *Les historiens anciens* (Paris, Bibliothèque de l'ENS Ulm-Lettres, Ms. 117).
- Weil, H., Reinach, Th. 1900. *Plutarque. De la musique* (Paris).
- Westphal, R. 1866. *Plutarch. Über die Musik* (Breslau).
- Wilamowitz, U. (von) 1900. *Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker* (Berlin).
- Wilamowitz, U. (von) 1921. *Geschichte der Philologie* (Leipzig).
- Wilamowitz, U. (von) 1929. *Erinnerungen* (Leipzig).
- Winnington-Ingram, R. 1956. *Plutarch. De musica*, JHS 76, 118-9.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. 1963. *Aristides Quintilianus. De musica* (Lipsiae).
- Ziegler, K. 1953. *Plutarchi Moralia. VI/3* (Lipsiae).



BRILL

GREEK AND ROMAN MUSICAL STUDIES 5 (2017) 267-278

GREEK
AND ROMAN
MUSICAL
STUDIES

brill.com/grms

Book Reviews



Franklin J. C.

2015. *Kinyras: The Divine Lyre*. Hellenic Studies 70. Washington DC, Center for Hellenic Studies, 834 pp. \$39.95 (hb). ISBN 9780674088306.

The main target of Franklin's investigation is the link between the Greek cultural-hero Kinyras and the divine lyre Kinnaru known from Ugaritic sources. Myths and legends about the king and musician Kinyras were transmitted in different versions through Greek and later sources, but the divine Kinnaru is known only from a very few Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) god-lists. Though their common etymology, derived from the musical instrument *knr* and known mainly from semitic sources, is generally accepted, the religious, cultural and semantic connections between them have never been investigated. Taking as his starting-point the questions "What is a Divine Lyre? And how could it beget a substantially metamusical Cypriot culture-hero?" (6) Franklin collects data from a large geographical area going back to the third millennium BC, referring even to the earliest finds of original lyres in southern Mesopotamia. Needless to say, his study integrates material from many disciplines, including Classical Studies, Biblical Studies, Assyriology, Sumerology, Ugaritistics, Hethitology and Near Eastern Archaeology. Though not expert in most of these fields, Franklin masters the challenges of such an undertaking in an exemplary fashion.

The book is divided into three Parts: Part 1 *The Cult of Kinnaru* deals mainly with ANE and Biblical material; Part 2 with *Kinyras on Cyprus*; and the much shorter Part 3 with *Kinyras and the Lands around Cyprus*. Navigation is facilitated by a short, clear introduction with a *Plan of the Study and Preliminary Conclusions* (7ff.). The book has seven appendices and closes with a separate study of ANE *Balang-Gods* by Wolfgang Heimpel. Very useful are the two indices: a general index and one of local names. The text is richly illustrated with 48 figures drawn by Glynnis Fawkes.

The material gathered and discussed in Part 1 primarily concerns the divine *knr*. Part 1 also provides an overview of current ANE music research. Franklin begins by presenting the main phenomena, which are divinised musical

instruments in early Mesopotamian periods and the *knr* and its identification in ANE and Biblical sources. The divinisation of objects in the surroundings of gods is a well-known and often discussed phenomenon in Mesopotamian religion. Franklin provides a very lucid explanation of the phenomenon focusing on the divine *balaġ*-instrument mainly used in ritual laments undertaken by the *kalû*, the lamentation priest.¹ Here we have to bear in mind that the addition of the divinising determinative *diġir* (Sumerian) is not at all consistent throughout the different Mesopotamian epochs, not even within one and the same genre.

Noteworthy are Franklin's observations about the "cognitive interaction of instrument and player" (36). In Gudea's texts from the third millennium BC the performer appears to be completely absorbed by the divinised instrument, both sharing the same name *Ushumgalkalama*. By contrast, in second and first millennium liturgies and rituals the performer is given an independent identity and high responsibility for the correct execution of the ritual.

In Chapter 2 we find an excellent outline of the religious link between the three entities King—Lyre—Goddess (mainly Ishtar and her many manifestations) within the context of 'Sacred Marriage'. Here, the king may appear as the performer while the lyre may take over the role of the goddess's lover (see also 102).

In Chapter 3, the basic premise for Franklin's analysis is the identification of the *knr* as a lyre (see especially 46ff.). Nevertheless, he admits that "Given the iconographic fluctuations, which span such a wide geographical and chronological range, *knr* cannot have been the only name applied to all of these instruments" (53). This is an important statement, since studies in ancient music especially have shown that terminology undergoes many changes due to different cultural influences. In Franklin's own words "we must beware of projecting modern organological distinctions onto ancient perceptions; the morphological difference between 'lyre' and 'harp', as defined by Hornbostel and Sachs, may have been less significant than performance functions" (532).² Not only do the names of ancient instruments rarely refer to shape and construction, but also the same name may refer to several different instruments.³

1 In addition to the literature referred to by Franklin (30-1) on the old Babylonian period see also Löhnert 2009, 61-87 and Shehata 2009, 66-93.

2 See also 57-8, concerning the number of strings on lyre or harp.

3 Apart from the *balaġ* discussed in Franklin's Appendix A and by Heimpel (573-632), other ANE examples are the *alû*, which may be a huge drum or a little lyre, and the *sammû*, which is either a harp or a lyre.

Chapters 4 to 8 are sorted chronologically and geographically: Ebla in the third millennium; Mari and the Amorite world in the early second millennium; then Hittite, Hurro-Hittite and Egyptian evidence from the later second millennium; next the Ugaritic *knr*; and finally Biblical sources on David, the lyre playing king. Though Franklin is not always operating within his own discipline, he consistently relies on latest literature and current translations. For each location discussed there is an overview of what we know about its musical culture from written sources, and emphasis is placed on texts relevant for the principal investigation. The evidence from Mari provides a good example of the internationality of music and musical performance.⁴ Special interest in foreign music was already expressed by king Shulgi of Ur in the late third millennium BC, who claimed to have mastered even foreign musical instruments perfectly. The evidence from Egypt, which Franklin discusses on pages 104 to 111, provides another good example of the adoption of foreign musical traditions. Here it is especially interesting to see that foreign music found its way into different cultures in peacetime as well as in times of political instability and foreign rule. Further, iconographic evidence from the time of Pharaoh Akhenaton (1364–48 BC) clearly demonstrates, that foreign religious music was not only introduced for its “exotic” character (107), but also for its religious functionality.

In many instances Franklin enriches the inter-disciplinary discussion with new ideas and suggestions. This is especially the case with the literary material from Ugarit. Most fascinating is the special case of the cymbalists mentioned as a group on their own in cultic ceremonies (114ff.). Though Franklin’s interpretation of an “orchestral leader” is quite persuasive, we may also point to modern Syrian-Orthodox church music. There, cymbals as well as staff-rattles, the so-called ‘fans’ (Greek *ρίπιδιον*), are used to underline specific stations and phrases within liturgical performance⁵ and thus act separately from choral or orchestral music.

Throughout his discussion Franklin refers to analogies and connects phenomena from a long distance in time and space, for example between the Biblical Salomon and king Shulgi of Ur. The special affiliation of king Shulgi of Ur to music (see comparison on page 152), which is unparalleled in other Mesopotamian epochs, may be explained through the close connections of his dynasty to Mari in Syria.⁶ Hence the image of the musician king thoroughly described in Chapter 8 with reference to the Biblical Salomon and David turns out to be a Syro-Levantine peculiarity. This is further indicated by the lack of

4 For the Amorites and research on their personal names see also Streck 2000.

5 Rabo 2016, 6–7 with references to other literature.

6 See for example Michalowski 2004.

musician kings in any later Mesopotamian epoch. Noteworthy in this context is Franklin's statement "He (i.e. David) is king in large part *because* he plays it (the *kinnōr*), incomparably well" (174). This adds a new dimension to the commonly cultic and thus functionary role of music playing. The Biblical king David as well as Shulgi of Ur may be seen as the first role models for the virtuous musician-star.

Part 2 is dedicated to the cultural-hero Kinyras and aims at linking him to the divine Kinnaru in Ugaritic sources. Franklin traces him through divergent sources starting in Chapters 9 and 10 with his connection to music. The discussion includes iconographic material from Cyprus showing that lyre-playing was a general feature of the Cypriot cult going back to the 11th century BC, which is much earlier than Pindar's earliest account connecting Kinyras to music. In Chapter 11 Franklin gives an overview of the early pre-Greek Cypriot musical culture based on archaeological sources. Here he manages to identify two different lyre-types, one of Levantine and the other of possibly older Cypriote origin. Chapter 12 deals with *Kinyras as Lamentor*, an aspect which is not obvious from Greek sources. Nevertheless, Franklin suggests several occasions in the Kinyras legends, which seem to point to lamenting contexts. His observations rely especially on the description of ANE music developed in Part 1. After drawing out Kinyras' special connection to Cyprus in Chapters 13 and 14, in Chapters 15 and 16 Franklin turns to tracing him back to his 'mainland origin', or—taken the other way around—how the 'Divine Lyre Kinnaru' has found its way to appear as a cultural-hero on Cyprus and adjacent regions. Franklin dates such a transformation to the early 2nd millennium BC.

These questions finally bring us to Part 3, which deals with the tradition of Kinyras in the cultural surrounding of Cyprus. Among other topics we find him as a personal name in Mycenaean and later Greek sources. In fact the comparison with the Sumerian *Balaĝ* found in ANE personal names of the 3rd millennium (435) is misleading. The latter has undoubtedly the status of a god, and it is a common feature of ANE personal names—as in most semitic languages—to be constructed as short prayers of intercession. The only other possible evidence for a divine Kinnaru in a personal name comes from the city of Alalakh and is referred to on pages 98 and 435. Unfortunately, the context is damaged and its correct reading remains obscure.

Kinyras' connection to the Levantine sites Byblos and Sidon are investigated in Chapters 19 and 20. Concerning the evidence for a Byblian Kinyras, again the focus is placed on lamenting cults, in this case for his son Adonis. Here too their background is traced to Mesopotamian religious traditions, namely to the Damu/Dumuzi mythology.⁷ In his final chapter (21) Franklin clarifies

7 For the Mesopotamian gods Damu and Dumuzi see also Fritz 2003.

Kinyras' connections to Sicily, incorporating a study on the Sicilian lyre-player seals from Ialysos on Rhodes.

Heimpel's study of Mesopotamian *Balang*-gods is not only a welcome supplement to the book, but also is often referred to by Franklin in his own chapters. Since it contains an extensive collection of all the evidence known for the divine *balaġ*-instrument, it is especially useful for further research in this field. Nevertheless, though Heimpel identifies the *balaġ* as a harp he admits that it might also be a lute in Gudea's times (573, 576), a kettledrum in the Ur III period (573, 579, 619) and a lyre in third millennium Ebla (575). Hence the presented evidence rather indicates that the term *balaġ* refers to several different musical instruments in different epochs and regions.⁸

Altogether, the book is excellently researched and is filled with new and interesting observations and ideas encouraging follow-up investigations in adjacent fields. It also shows how much we are in need of up-to-date textual editions and comprehensible commentaries that address issues in several different disciplines. As to the study of ancient music, Franklin's book clearly demonstrates that music is interlinked with many aspects of society and therefore provides us with new insights into political, religious and historical developments.

Dahlia Shehata

Würzburg

dahlia.shehata@uni-wuerzburg.de

Bibliography

- Fritz, M. M. 2003. "... und weinten um Tammuz": die Götter Dumuzi-Ama'ušumgal'anna und Damu (Münster).
- Löhnert, A. 2009. "Wenn die Sonne tritt heraus!": Eine Klage zum Auszug Enlils mit einer Untersuchung zur Komposition und Tradition sumerischer Klagelieder (Münster).
- Michalowski, P. 2004. *The Ideological Foundation of the Ur III State*, in: Meyer, J.-W., Sommerfeld, W. (eds.) 2000 v. Chr.: Politische, wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Entwicklung im Zeichen einer Jahrtausendwende (Saarbrücken), 219-35.
- Rabo, G. 2016. *Die liturgischen Geräte in der Syrisch-Orthodoxen Kirche*, Online Journal of Syrian Orthodox Church, Syriac Studies and Aramaeans 14.11.2016, www.suryoyo.uni-goettingen.de/library/geraete.pdf.

⁸ See now Shehata 2017 (forthcoming).

- Shehata, D. 2009. *Musiker und ihr vokales Repertoire. Untersuchungen zu Inhalt und Organisation von Musikerberufen und Liedgattungen in altbabylonischer Zeit* (Göttingen).
- Shehata, D. 2017 (forthcoming). *Eine mannshohe Leier im altbabylonischen Ištar-Ritual aus Mari RA 35, 1ff.* (=FM III No. 2), *Altorientalische Forschungen* 44 (Heft 3/4).
- Streck, M. P. 2000. *Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonschen Zeit. 1: Die Amurriter, die onomastische Forschung, Orthographie und Phonologie, Nominalmorphologie* (Münster).

Wallace, R. W.

Reconstructing Damon: Music, Wisdom Teaching and Politics in Perikles' Athens,
Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2015, xxiii, 223 pp. £55 (hb). ISBN: 9780199685738

Wallace's *Reconstructing Damon* represents a welcome addition to the growing literature on ancient Greek music as it fills a long-standing desideratum: an updated and comprehensive collection of testimonia about the crucial but elusive character of Damon of Oa. Until now, scholars interested in investigating the life and activities of this key musical theorist, intellectual and political figure had to rely on incomplete and otherwise inadequate collections of texts produced in the 1950s (Diels and Kranz 1952; Lasserre 1954).

Wallace's collection represents a substantial improvement on his predecessors, as it includes "51 passages mentioning Damon by name, of which 28 do not appear in earlier collections; three additional passages mention[ing] Damon's followers, in two cases by name; three more passages show[ing] his direct influence" (ix).¹ For each of these, Wallace provides a revised Greek text with minimal apparatus as well as an English translation and commentary of variable length and scope. This valuable material is accompanied by four introductory chapters which aim to identify the key features of Damon's work and situate them within the intellectual and political milieu of classical Athens, as well as four appendices that tackle individual interpretative questions.

This brief overview clarifies, I hope, that Wallace's book marks a critical step in Damonian scholarship and is destined to have a major influence on the future debate on Damon's shadowy but intriguing figure. Precisely for this reason, however, I believe it is important to discuss in some detail Wallace's problematic treatment of Damon's views on musical ethics and their technical counterparts— notions that are clearly crucial for the study of ancient Greek music.

Borrowing an expression coined by Abert (1899), Wallace labels Damon's interest in the "psychological, behavioural, and hence social and political affects

1 It is not clear, however, what exactly the author includes in each of these categories. The *Conspectus of Testimonia* provided on 207-8 shows a total of 50 numbered items, comprising 42 passages that mention Damon by name (A1-25 and B1-18), two passages on his followers (C1-2), three "possibly reflecting Damon's influence" (172, D1-3) and two "of alleged Damonian influence" (178, E1-2). Some of these items are split into groups (e.g. the ostraca bearing Damon's name are listed as 22a-d) but counting them as separate elements leads to a total of 54 passages mentioning Damon, not 51. The arguments deployed to demonstrate Damon's "direct" or "possible" (*sic*) influence on other sources are not always persuasive, especially in the case of *PHib*. 1.13 (=D2) and Virgil's *Eclogue* 8 (=D3).

of music and poetry" (24) as "the *êthos* theory". This definition recurs frequently throughout this study but we are nowhere told what this 'theory' entailed exactly in Wallace's view. Of course, it is hard to pin down the details of this question given the scanty evidence at our disposal; nevertheless, using such a definite expression so pervasively without clarifying its implications might give uninitiated readers the misleading impression that there was a recognised, coherent body of knowledge on these matters in the first place. But this is a far cry from the picture outlined by the extant sources which, rather than detailing such a comprehensive 'system' or 'theory', present us with a wide variety of questions related to musical ethics. To just name a few: does music itself have ethical attributes? Is it capable of reproducing different moral characters aesthetically and engendering them in the soul? Does it 'cure' undesirable psychological dispositions or even physical ailments? Does it achieve these effects by means of specific intervals, rhythms, modes and instruments?

These are quite separate questions and have received an array of conflicting and sometimes bewildering answers by poets, philosophers and other intellectuals since the earliest stages of Greek literature. For these reasons, Damon can hardly be described as the "first" to have addressed these issues² and it would be useful to understand better what theoretical and technical achievements should be identified as "particularly his".³ If "Damon's *êthos* theory depended on the *realia* of perception" (48), did he examine them from a qualitative perspective, a quantitative one or both? Did he focus exclusively on rhythms, as might be suggested in *Republic* 3, or did he investigate also the ethical effects of different instruments and modes?

Wallace provides conflicting answers to these key questions. On the one hand, in several passages he seems to assume tacitly that Damon's 'theory' did not concern only the ethical effects of rhythms but also that of different modes.⁴ On the other, Wallace rightly observes that in *Republic* 3 "Plato does

2 101: "Damon first studied the emotional, behavioural, and hence social and political affects of music and poetic metre"; 108: "Much other evidence could be adduced, especially on the *êthos* theory of music which he first developed".

3 30: "Although the Greeks had always known the affective power of music [...] Damon studied music affect formally and scientifically. Did he 'invent'—that is, first formulate and investigate—the *êthos* theory of music? [...] Certainly the theory was particularly his".

4 E.g. 201-2: "Plato's Protagoras applies the *êthos* theory to schoolchildren, his *kitharistês* 'forces the boys' souls to become familiar with rhythms and *harmoniai*, that they be more gentle and, becoming more rhythmic and more harmonized, useful in whatever they say or do' (*Prt.* 326b). The theory is Damon's, although we know nothing of his ethical stance".

not attribute his interpretation of the *harmoniai* to Damon" (37)⁵ but then argues that Damon "could not have categorized the *êthos* of individual *harmoniai* because that varied from song to song" (37);⁶ therefore, he concludes, Damon's theories must have focussed on "the other, more variable qualities of music, sometimes called the *poikilia*, which might include many different things such as pitch and tempo" (37). In Wallace's view, this reading is confirmed by Plato's later reference to Damon's famous pronouncement on the correlation between changes to musical *tropoi* and to political laws⁷ since, according to him, the term *tropos* indicated a musical 'style' in general and definitely did not refer to technical features such as the intervallic structure of a scale.⁸ This categorical judgement, however, is unwarranted. Even though it is true that the term *tropos* could indicate a musical style broadly defined, many sources—both technical and not—show that it could also refer to the harmonic organisation of a musical piece;⁹ and precisely this aspect is often described as one of the crucial components that determine the overall ethical effect of a given musical composition, in conjunction with specific melodic idioms and instrumental accompaniments.¹⁰ Furthermore, differently from what Wallace claims, Plato's contextual reference to a new musical 'form' (*eidos kainon mousikês*, *R.* 424c3-4)

5 181: "these lines need not reproduce Damon's views" since "Plato was capable of having his own thoughts". Apparently, though, the same charitable concession should not be made to Euripides and the *harmonikoi* attacked in *PHib.* 1.13, whose discussions of the ethical effects of music are straightforwardly identified as "Damonian" (25-6). On harmonic *epideixeis* and their cultural background, see e.g. Barker 2007, 68-104.

6 This is not the place to argue this point in detail but this conclusion is far from being as uncontroversial as Wallace implies; elsewhere he himself seems to defend the opposite view, namely that "[Damon's] approach was not negative, sceptical, or relativist. The *êthos* consequences of music and metre were the same for all" (101). Similarly, scholars do not actually agree that "on a seven-stringed lyre, [the two] tetrachords shared one note", (33): see most forcefully Hagel 2010 (esp. 112-6), who appears in Wallace's rather selective bibliography but is not taken into account here.

7 *R.* 424c: "the *tropoi* of music are never changed without changing the most important political laws, as Damon says and I believe too".

8 148: "the common translation 'mode' is incorrect".

9 E.g. Aristox. *Harm.* 29.14-30.1; Gaud. *Harm.* 338.16; Plut. *An Seni* 793a; D.H. *Comp.* 19.

10 In this connection, the Aristoxenian discussion of the so-called *spondeiazôn tropos* ('libation style/mode') is particularly illuminating, as its ethical effect is associated with its harmonic structure as well as the use or avoidance of specific notes in the vocal melody and the aulos accompaniment: cf. Ps.-Plu. *De Mus.* 1137b-e, 1134f-1135b. Furthermore, the 'Lydian *tropos*' (Pi. *O.* 14.17) mentioned by Wallace (35) to illustrate the broader meaning of this term is paralleled in Pindar by an equally loose use of the expression 'Lydian *harmonia*' (*N.* 4.45) and, as far as we can tell, the same interaction of different musical

may well point to a technical usage of the term on Damon's part. In fact, the same term was employed in a technical sense in *Republic* 3, precisely in the course of a discussion of the basic theoretical models which produce different modes and rhythms and their ethical effects—a discussion that is significantly drawn to a close by Socrates' proposal to “consult with Damon on these issues”.¹¹

Similar problems affect Wallace's discussion of the technicalities of Damon's research into rhythm and metre. In particular, Wallace rightly states that the enoplian rhythm is characterised as “composite” (143) in Plato's account of Damon's work and then adds that this rhythm “joins measures with a relationship of 1:2 (short long), such as iambics, with 2:2 measures, in this case anapaests”. This might have been what Damon had in mind, but it is far from clear from the artfully confused depiction offered by Socrates; more importantly, we are not told where Wallace's resolute definition of enoplian as combination of “anapaests and iambs” stems from, and this term has notoriously been employed in starkly different ways by rhythmicians and metricians, both ancient and modern.¹²

On page 173, however, we find a different but equally confident definition: “The ‘composite enoplion’ was the feminine *hemiepes* formed of two dactyls and one spondee, — u u — u u —, the acephalous form of the archilochian enoplion, or two feminine *hemiepe*, — u u — u u — — u u — u u —” (*sic*). This second definition is puzzling not only because it differs significantly from the previous but especially because the metrical sequences provided do not correspond to the labels attached to them. The sequence printed by

components (harmonic structure, pitch ranges, musical idioms, instrumental preferences, etc.) characterised also the notion of *harmonia*.

- 11 R. 400a: “there are three basic forms (εἰδῆ) from which the steps are woven together, just as in notes there are four, from which come all the modes [...] but let's consult with Damon on these issues”. In later technical literature, the term *eidos* is consistently used to identify different species of the fourth, fifth and especially the octave: e.g. Aristox. *Harm.* 74.18; Aristid. Quint. *De Mus.* 15.10–20 (cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1290a20–1). A specific correlation between a *tropē* of the *ēthos* of a musical piece and harmonic modulations is outlined by Ptolemy (*Harm.* 99.11–25). This passage is quoted by Wallace (35) but is rapidly dismissed on the grounds that “allegedly the evidence, while slim, does not suggest” that the “*harmoniai* were fixed at different pitches”. However, Hagel (2010, esp. 34–8, 380–95) has clearly shown that the ‘ancient *harmoniai*’ preserved by Aristides Quintilianus were indeed set at different pitches and these pitch differences formed the background for the later systematisation of *tonoi*.
- 12 Cf. West 1982, 195; Martinelli 1995, 329; Gentili and Lomiento 2003, 197–219. The categories of ‘rhythm’ and ‘metre’ are often used interchangeably by Wallace (e.g. 143: “Whether [Damon] dealt with other aspects of rhythm, such as caesura or diaeresis or patterns of word endings, is unknown”) but this was far from the norm in ancient musical theory: cf. West 1992, 242–5, 129–59.

Wallace (— — — — —) is known as masculine, not feminine, *hēmiepes*; a feminine *hēmiepes* was not necessarily formed by two dactyls and one spondee, since the last syllable could be either short or long — — — — — x;¹³ and the Archilochean enoplon, as defined by Wallace's authority Gentili, corresponds to yet another metrical sequence: x — — — — — x.¹⁴

To be fair, in the introduction Wallace forewarns the reader that "local experts may well find my brief discussions of various topics deficient [...] Some tangential areas I cannot pretend to have mastered [...] as Greek music itself is notoriously obscure" (x-xi). Such intellectual honesty is laudable and rare but would suggest greater caution and restraint from taking bold stances on controversial technical issues: after all, Socrates too did not venture into such technicalities and deferred them to Damon's expertise, choosing to focus on more substantial philosophical questions.

It is precisely on this broader cultural and historical level that Wallace's book provides many important and lasting contributions to Damonian scholarship and I hope that my technical criticisms will not give readers the misleading impression that they reflect the value of the book as a whole. On the contrary, in addition to providing an excellent and sorely needed collection of the extant testimonia on Damon, Wallace's book offers some key insights into a number of crucial issues for the study of Damon's intellectual and political figure.

Among the strongest results is Wallace's forceful dismissal of the long-lived notion that Damon was a conservative musical theorist with strong Pythagorean leanings. By contrast, as Wallace shows lucidly in Chapter 2, Damon's intellectual profile was akin to that of other 5th-century theorists known as the 'sophists', such as Protagoras, Prodicus and Hippias.¹⁵ A related and equally important achievement of this book is showing how Damon was a "progressive, consciously ideological democrat like Perikles" (52-4; 148) and that precisely these traits help us understand why a musical theorist became the target of political attacks and was eventually ostracised.¹⁶ Furthermore, Chapter 4 presents a fuller version of an argument persuasively advanced by Wallace in previous publications, namely that Damon never delivered a speech "in which [he] recommended that the Areopagites learn music" (53). In Wallace's view, Damon's alleged 'Areopagiticus' was in fact "a fourth-century fantasy" (97),

13 Indeed, the final syllable of this sequence must have originally been short, as it probably derived from the trochaic caesura of a dactylic hexameter.

14 Gentili 1950, 52-6, on the basis of Archil. fr. 168.1 West (Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε) quoted by Hephaestion (*Ench.* 27.10, 47.10, 48.19). Gentili is acknowledged as the author of this definition but the reference to his publication is missing.

15 See esp. 3-21, 198-200.

16 See 51-75, 135-6, 186-93.

which may have stemmed from a philosophical dialogue written by Heraclides of Pontus. To support this interesting hypothesis, Wallace presents a thorough discussion of the relevant passages of Philodemus' *De Musica* and offers many new readings based on his fresh examination of several Herculaneum papyri.¹⁷

In conclusion, Wallace has done the scholarly community a good service in sharing the results of his 30 years' work on Damon and his book will shape the image of this important Athenian intellectual for many generations.¹⁸ This is not to say that the debate on some key aspects of Damon's work is definitively settled, but Wallace's book certainly represents the best tool currently available to make further progress in understanding the legacy of this wondrous 'sophist in disguise'.

Tosca Lynch

Jesus College Oxford

tosca.lynych@jesus.ox.ac.uk

Bibliography

- Abert, H. 1899. *Die Lehre vom Ethos in der Griechischen Musik* (Leipzig).
 Barker, A. 2007. *The Science of Harmonics in Classical Greece* (Cambridge).
 Diels, H., Kranz, W. (Hrsg.) 1952⁶. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (Berlin).
 Gentili, B. 1950. *Metrica greca arcaica* (Messina/Firenze).
 Gentili, B., Lomiento, L. 2003. *Metrica e ritmica: storia delle forme poetiche nella Grecia antica* (Milano).
 Hagel, S. 2010. *Ancient Greek Music: a Technical History* (Cambridge).
 Lasserre, F. (ed.) 1954. *Plutarque, De la musique* (Olten/Lausanne).
 Martinelli, M.C. 1995. *Gli strumenti del poeta: elementi di metrica greca* (Bologna).
 West, M.L. 1982. *Greek Metre* (Oxford).
 West, M.L. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).

¹⁷ See 77-97, 157-65.

¹⁸ The book is handsomely done and I noticed only a few typos: 25 "eidon" for "eidos"; 59 the word "notes" and not "*phthongoi*" should be underlined; 78, missing ' after δ; 86, the reference should be B10, not B11; 17, the reference in the apparatus should be to line 6, not 7; 119, a space is missing between "recht" and "witziges"; 124, the first vowel in *Dēmōn* should be marked long; 134, the reference should be A19, not A18; 173, "enoplios" for "enoplios" and "archilochian" for "Archilochian". The style is lively and engaging but sometimes Wallace overstates his cases to achieve this end: e.g. 104 "Among fifth-century intellectuals, only he [i.e. Damon] and Socrates had successors who worked in their names down through antiquity".